DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 299 HE 019 965

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Comments from the Community. Working Papers and Testimony before the ACR 3 Committee on Educational Opportunities and Services for Students with Disabilities in California. Report 86-23. |
| INSTITUTION | California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento. |
| PUB DATE | Jul 86 |
| NOTE | 146p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Publications Office, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. |
| PUB TYPE | Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Accessibility (for Disabled); Accountability; *Ancillary School Services; Articulation (Education); College Admission; College Preparation; *College Students; Community Colleges; *Disabilities; Educational Assessment; Educational Opportunities; Financial Support; Hearings; Higher Education; Program Evaluation; *Public Colleges; Public Policy; *Statewide Planning; Technical Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | *California |

ABSTRACT

The achievement of educational opportunity goals for the disabled in California is addressed in this report, which includes three brief working papers prepared for regional hearings and written testimony provided by 30 individuals. Included is the text of Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 3, which directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission to establish a committee of representatives from schools, colleges, and universities to develop and adopt a plan by the end of 1986 to achieve three equal opportunity goals. The goals for the disabled concern admission to public four-year colleges, completion of vocational technical programs or transfer from community colleges to four-year colleges, and completion of baccalaureate programs. Titles of the working papers are: "Ways of Improving the Academic Preparation of Disabled Students in Secondary Schools if Underpreparation Results from Their Disability," "Financing Services for Disabled Students," and "Evaluation and Accountability." (SW)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED278299

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA/Postsecondary
Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# Summary

In meeting the requirement of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3 to develop and adopt a plan to achieve the State's goals for students with disabilities, the ACR 3 Planning Committee held five regional hearings during early 1986 to provide an opportunity for interested persons to provide information and ideas for the plan.

This document contains three working papers prepared for the hearings along with the written testimony submitted by these individuals. The foreword by the chair of the Planning Committee, Bruce Hamlett, provides background information on ACR 3 and the work of the committee. The appendix lists the names of all individuals who testified at each hearing, whether or not they submitted written comments.

Using the information and issues presented at the hearings, the Planning Committee is currently preparing a report on ways the State can better serve all students with disabilities.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained from the Publications Office of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Further information about it may be obtained from Suzanne Ness, the public information officer of the Commission, at (916) 322-0145. Information about the work of the committee may be obtained from the ACR 3 Committee Staff at (916) 324-3885.

# COMMENTS FROM THE COMMUNITY

## *Working Papers and Testimony Before the ACR 3 Committee on Educational Opportunities and Services for Students with Disabilities in California*

**CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION**
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**COMMISSION REPORT 86-23**
**PUBLISHED JULY 1986**

THIS report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 86-23 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

## *Contents*

FOREWORD 1

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3 3

WORKING PAPERS 7

- Ways of Improving the Academic Preparation of Disabled Students 9
- Financing Services for Disabled Students 13
- Evaluation and Accountability 15

WRITTEN TESTIMONY 17

- Elizabeth Bacon 19
- Michael Bailiff 23
- Beverly Barrett 27
- Sharon Bonney 31
- Harriet Clendenen 35
- William Cutler 41
- Susan Eiland-Rickman 45
- Helen Elias 47
- Ana Garza 49
- Nancy Haley 55
- Martha Hansen 61
- Julia Haraksin 63
- Anne Heller 67
- Bob Hughlett 69
- Tom Humphries 71
- Gordon Johnson 81
- Roland Jones 83
- Cindy Kolb 85
- Paul Lockman 95
- Eugene Lozano 99
- Florie Luther 101
- Jackie Mann 103
- Mark Matsui 105
- Maria Morais 109
- Betsy Nordmeyer 113
- Nadia Powers 115
- Paul Preston 117
- Roberta Savage 135
- Jerome Shapiro 141
- Patricia Sonntag 143

APPENDIX: Presenters of Testimony at the Regional Hearings 151

# *Foreword*

ASSEMBLY Concurrent Resolution 3 (Vasconcellos), which is reproduced on pages 3-6 of this report, directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission to establish a committee of representatives from schools, colleges, and universities throughout California to develop and adopt a plan by the end of 1986 to achieve three specific equal educational opportunity goals and to "serve all disabled students who are able to profit from instruction and make reasonable academic progress."

The three specific goals are:

A. That the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates eligible for admission to public four-year colleges, universities, and community colleges be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates generally

B. That the nondisabled-disabled composition of students completing vocational technical programs or transferring from community colleges into four-year institutions be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of students entering community colleges.

C. That the nondisabled-disabled composition of baccalaureate degree recipients from California colleges and universities be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates who are eligible for admission to a four-year educational institution.

ACR 3 directed that the following elements be included in this plan:

1. Ways of improving the academic preparation of disabled students in secondary schools, if underpreparation results from this disability;

2. A description of existing comprehensive institutional efforts to meet the educational needs of disabled students;

3. Priorities for action and timelines to achieve the State's three goals for postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates by disabled students;

4. A long-term funding approach for programs serving postsecondary students which reflects the actual costs of providing certain services and instruction;

5. A mechanism to evaluate institutional progress in achieving the goals contained in ACR 3; and

6. A means of collecting data from secondary schools, community colleges, and other sources in order to project the future numbers of students with specific kinds of disabilities who will be eligible to attend California's colleges and universities.

The ACR 3 Planning Committee held its first meeting in October 1985 and has met monthly since that date. The members of the Committee are:

James R. Bouquin, Director
Disabled Student Services
Stanford University

Joel Bryan, Director
Services to Handicapped Students
University of California, Davis

Susanna Castillo-Robson, Universitywide
Coordinator, Disabled Student Services
University of California

Don Duren, Systemwide Coordinator
Disabled Student Services
The California State University

Bob Farran, Principal
Fairvalley School
Covina, California

Steven R. Fasteau, Director
Disabled Student Services
El Camino Community College District

Keith Foster, Educational Consultant
California Department of Rehabilitation

Paul Gussman
Office of Higher Education
California State Department of Education

Bruce Hamlett, Specialist
Government and Public Affairs
California Postsecondary Education Commission
*(Chair)*

Jim Harrington, Associate Dean of Students
College of the Redwoods

Robert Howard
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Catherine Johns, Research Specialist
San Diego Community College District

Martha Kanter, President
California Association of Postsecondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED)

Weldon Percy, Coordinator
Disabled Student Services
California State University, Fresno

William Pickens, Executive Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Patricia L. Romero, Director
Disabled Student Services
University of California, Irvine

Leo D. Sandoval
Special Education Division
California State Department of Education

Lenore Silverman
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Working with the Commitee on the project are Marilyn Jorgensen and Kathy Warriner of the California Postsecondary Education Commission Staff

In order to provide an opportunity for all interested parties throughout California to present information and their opinions on issues to be considered in the new statewide plan for disabled students, five regional hearings were held in May 1986. In preparation for these hearings, the Planning Committee wrote three issue papers designed to provide background information and questions to assist individuals interested in testifying. Prior to the hearing dates, these issue papers were distributed widely in California.

The following pages present (1) Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3, (2) the three issue papers written by the ACR 3 Planning Committee, (3) the written testimony submitted at the hearings, and (4) the agenda for each of the five regional hearings.

This document will be used by the Planning Committee as resource material in the preparation of the ACR 3 Plan.

---

# *Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3*

---

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3—Relative to disabled persons.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACR 3, Vasconcellos. Disabled persons: postsecondary education.

This measure would direct the California Postsecondary Education Commission to convene a committee composed of representatives from the University of California, the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the State Department of Education, with the cooperation of other appropriate state agencies, for the purpose of developing and adopting a plan to achieve certain goals and containing specified elements with respect to disabled students who are able to profit from instruction and make reasonable academic progress.

WHEREAS, The Legislature recognizes that the composition of California society is becoming increasingly inclusive and heterogeneous; and

WHEREAS, Every Californian, including those who are disabled, has the right to be fully recognized and included in the operation of our state and society and culture; and

WHEREAS, It is the intent of the Legislature that all persons, regardless of their previous educational background, should have the opportunity to proceed as far as their abilities allow them in the completion of high-quality programs at the elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and graduate education levels; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature recognizes that disabled persons have historically been underrepresented at colleges and universities and consequently have been unprepared to fill highly skilled jobs to meet the challenges of California's future economic and technological growth; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature recognizes that equal educational opportunities for disabled persons will help enhance the education of all students and better prepare everyone for life together in a heterogeneous society; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature recognizes that equal educational opportunities for all persons is a shared responsibility of educational institutions at all levels, requiring both the cooperative efforts of these institutions and comprehensive coordinating efforts of all existing school and campus resources; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring,* That the Legislature hereby declares its particular concern regarding persons with disabilities and their historical underrepresentation in California postsecondary education; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the state's goals are as follows:

(a) That the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates eligible for admission to public four-year colleges, universities, and community colleges be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates generally.

(b) That the nondisabled-disabled composition of students completing vocational technical programs or transferring from community colleges into four-year institutions be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of students entering community colleges.

(c) That the nondisabled-disabled composition of baccalaureate degree recipients from California colleges and universities be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates who are eligible for admission to a four-year educational institution; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the California Postsecondary Education Commission shall convene a committee composed of representatives from the University of California, the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the State Department of Education, with the cooperation of other appropriate state agencies, for the purpose of developing and adopting a plan to achieve these goals and to serve all disabled students who are able to profit from instruction and make reasonable academic progress. These representatives shall provide ample opportunity for all interested parties to present information and their opinions on the committee's plan; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this committee's plan and its recommendations for action contain the following elements, with respect to disabled persons who are able to profit from instruction and make reasonable academic progress:

(1) Ways of improving the academic preparation of disabled students in secondary schools, if underpreparation is a result of their disability. The State Department of Education shall present data on this issue.

(2) Priorities for action to achieve the state's goals, reasonable timelines to achieve the goals based on specific information from each segment about the extent of underrepresentation, the institution responsible therefor, and a long-term funding approach for programs serving postsecondary students which will reflect the actual costs of providing certain services and instruction which meet general criteria related to serving the particular needs of students with disabilities in each segment.

(3) Specific recommendations for shared responsibility and cooperative, coordinated efforts by all secondary, postsecondary, and postbaccalaureate institutions.

(4) Description of comprehensive institutional efforts for coordinating existing school, campus resources, general academic programs, and general student services, to meet the educational needs of disabled students, and if necessary, recommendations to strengthen, expand or reorganize these efforts.

(5) A mechanism to evaluate annually the progress by each segment in achieving the goals identified above, and provision for the transmittal of this evaluation to the Legislature.

(6) A means of collecting data from secondary schools,

community colleges, and other sources in order to project the numbers of students with specific kinds of disabilities who are eligible for admission to colleges and universities in order to aid planning appropriate services for these students; and be it further

*Resolved,* That an assessment of the implementation of the committee's plan be systematically and formally reviewed on a triennial basis. This review will be conducted by a committee headed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission and composed of members representing the Department of Education, the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this plan be submitted to the Legislature on or before December 31, 1986; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a copy of this resolution to the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

O

# *Working Papers*

# 1

# *Ways of Improving the Academic Preparation of Disabled Students in Secondary Schools if Underpreparation Results from Their Disability*

ASSSEMBLY Concurrent Resolution 3 (Vasconcellos) has directed that the Planning Committee consider "ways of improving the academic preparation of disabled students in secondary schools, if underpreparation is a result of their disability." In responding to this topic, the Planning Committee has identified three basic questions to organize the issues and inquiry into recommendations for improvements.

---

### Question 1: Are comparable data about disabled students available from all segments to assess parity, problems, and progress?

A state goal identified in ACR 3 is that "the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates eligible for admission to public four-year colleges, universities, and community colleges be similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates generally." This makes it important to determine if definitions of disabilities and information on their incidence within the educational segments are available, so that composition data are representative of the total population of students. Our experience suggests that definitions and resources differ among the systems, such as for learning disabled students, arising from State codes and mandates with different effects. College outreach programs find K-12 definitions based upon need for special services, whereby local resources influence data on student participation Integration of students with disabilities results in limited information in the secondary system except for the subpopulation served by special education resource rooms or special education special day class programs housed in regular school campuses. College information on their student populations depend upon self-identified disabilities in addition to those served by disabled student service programs.

Disabled students participating in the K-12 system are only part of the potentially college-eligible population served in postsecondary education, since anyone can become a member of the disabled population at any time. Rates of disabled student participation, graduation, and college eligibility in the K-12 system are only part of the measures of appropriate representation of the group in postsecondary education.

Parity thus defined requires common definitions of disabilities, along with methods for identifying and tracking students throughout their educational experience. We should consider alternatives if these are unrealistic.

---

### Question 2: What do we include in the definition of "academic preparation"?

Our working definition should be broad enough to encompass *all* school offerings viewed as promoting college eligibility and aspirations. Included are courses to develop academic competencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and foreign language. Disabled students may need to learn to perform these activities using non-traditional methods. For example, students handicapped by traditional print need competitive "reading skills" tailored to alternate media such as braille or audiotape.

Graduation requirements, course descriptions, curriculum standards and mainstreaming opportunities developed for programs serving the disabled student need to be consistent with the expectations for the regular student population. Reasonable accommodations should be applied to assure comparable experiences when the specific disability limits mainstreaming or participation in significant learning experiences that are prerequisite to the postsecondary experience.

Students need to develop reasoning and study skills, and effective techniques for taking standardized tests. They need access to counselors supportive of college goals with information about options. Access to elective school activities provides unique practice in integrating concepts and offers opportunities for leadership skills that are important, especially for eligibility to private colleges.

---

### Question 3: Does underpreparation result from disability?

The fundamental question is whether disabled students have "similar access" to academic preparation activities of the K-12 system; or in the case of more restrictive K-12 educational settings, is the expectation level comparable to the regular program? In either case, does the disabled student have equal opportunity to those prerequisite classes and experiences in order to be eligible for and enroll in higher education. Available evidence indiates that they do not consistently have similar access or expectations. Such access or opportunities are often based in local districts' priorities for serving the disabled population in view of existing resources and the total education program of the district.

The range of educational experiences of the K-12 disabled population may range from segregated special classes with low performance expectations or lack of qualified personnel through programs providing reasonable accommodation of the disabled student into the regular educational program with appropriate, effective support services. Compromises to the commitment to mainstreaming opportunities alone may greatly limit the social development of students who may be academically capable of competing. Some disabilities require teaching strategies, techniques and/or the use of equipment that limit the ability to master some higher language skills as is sometimes the case of the deaf or visually handicapped population. Some physically handicapped students may not have had access to computer assisted means of instruction and expression as to receive basic training or credit for knowledge learned. Regular classes may have barriers that limit participation of disabled students to unequal substitutes such as watching another student engaged in operating a computer or performing an experiment. Inadequate resources, administrative expediency and overall insufficient funding of special education may all have an impact on underpreparation.

Disabled student programs in postsecondary education encounter many students underprepared for college by their secondary school experiences. Examples of academic underpreparation resulting from disability include (1) barriers to taking required college preparatory classes, (2) auxiliary aids and services to perform high school work that is less supportive than disability accommodation for college classes, (3) a lack of information on testing accommodations for the SAT or ACT, resulting in limited student participation and, (4) a lack of counseling services designed to match student needs in terms of available services at the postsecondary level. Access to elective activities and information about college options is inconsistent. These factors limit the opportunities of students with disabilities in the secondary schools to meet eligibility criteria of the four-year colleges and may also impact the desire to attend two-year colleges.

In addition, several factors restrict disabled student aspirations for postsecondary educational opportunities, such as lower expectations of academic performance, lack of course descriptions for special classes that meet the requirement for entrance and the goal of many secondary programs toward development of entry level employability skills as opposed to postsecondary educational opportunities. Information may be lacking on the means for attending college, such as information about financial aid, rehabilitation support, and methods for adapting to residential and academic needs.

---

### Questions for the public hearings

1. What data are available regarding academic achievement and performance of students with disabilities, including the numbers and causes of dropouts?

2. How are services provided to students with disabilities in public schools, and which of these approaches seems most effective?

3. Does a data system exist for following students through the K-12 system, and what mechanism, if any, is in place for bridging handicapped twelfth grade students into the community colleges or four-year institutions?

4. What actions should be taken so that the educational segments will have adequate data systems to identify and track the population of

students with disabilities, including those from ethnic minority backgrounds?

5. What can be done to provide forms of disability accommodation and skills that prepare students for postsecondary education?

6. What activities and techniques are needed to better counsel and inform disabled students to appropriately support their aspirations to college?

7. What new types and sources of training should be available to school personnel? What professional and role-model qualifications should be sought?

8. How can the broad extracurricular participation needed for skill development and qualifications for college be supported?

9. What can the schools, colleges, and universities do to address socio-cultural differences combined with disability, such as in ethnic minorities?

10. Is there a continuum of services provided for disabled students as they move through the public schools and into the postsecondary institutions? If this continuum does not exist, what actions should be taken to implement the needed services?

11. What are the most critical educational needs for students with disabilities in the public schools, as they are attempting to gain the necessary academic preparation for college? What do you recommend in order to respond more effectively to these educational needs?

# 2 *Financing Services for Disabled Students*

FINANCING policies for disabled student programs in California's public institutions of higher education developed at different times and in response to the different needs of the three segments. The purpose of this paper is to describe the evolution of State finance for these services and the problems evident in the current system.

---

## The history of finance practices in California

Special State funding for the Community Colleges emerged through AB 77 (Chapter 275, Statutes of 1976). Except in the most general terms, AB 77 did not define what type of services were to be provided, but rather created a categorical fund from which Community Colleges were to provide whatever services they wished. The size of this fund was determined by multiplying $12.19 per unit of Average Daily Attendance (ADA) by the total number of ADA reported for the system as a whole, which was obviously not responsive to the actual number of disabled students nor to the actual cost of serving those students.

AB 77's rationale was that Community College districts should not bear the burden of providing costly services, those which exceeded their regular revenue from ADA and income from other sources, from their regular budget. Thus the State would reimburse districts for the difference between "excess direct cost" and the regular revenue derived for students. Predictably, the Community Colleges developed a broad array of services and their claims soon exhausted all the funds within the $12.19 per ADA cap. As the number of disabled students increased and funds remained capped, the "unfunded excess direct cost" rose substantially.

Funding in the four-year segments developed differently. In 1974, the California State Colleges (now the State University) requested funds from the Legislature for a pilot project, and its success led to the appropriation of $500,000 in 1976-77 for that segment. In 1979, the University of California first received State funds directly for disabled student services. Further, the 1979-80 Budget Act established a policy that all three segments should receive direct State support based on a formula which provided $465 for each disabled student served in those segments, with the understanding that this would fund a set of "core" services, to be developed by an intersegmental task force.

These "core" services were never adoped as State policy. Nevertheless the University of California and the California State University use them as "guidelines" for providing services for students with disabilities. Among these "core" services are interpreter services; reader services; notetaker services; mobility assistance; registration assistance; priority enrollment; special parking; facilitation of access to all programs; access to special adaptive equipment ; referral to appropriate on- or off-campus resources, services, and agencies; arrangements for specialized educational materials; establishment and maintenance of a list of available readers, interpreters, notetakers, mobility assistants, and attendants; supplemental orientation as determined by individual needs; and test taking arrangements.

The California Community Colleges offer additional services under a "per capita" approach. Provisions in AB 8 (1979) replaced those of AB 77 with a policy of an appropriation for services for a fixed number of disabled students, rather than for total ADA. The $465 for all segments was a rough estimate of the per-capita cost of serving disabled students in the Community Colleges alone.

It was clear from hearings in 1979 before the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education that legislators intended this "per capita" approach to be used on a temporary basis with the understanding that the State would provide sufficient funds to insure necessary services for all disabled students and that a permanent mechanism would be developed which more accurately reflected the actual cost of operating the programs after these costs could be documented. Supplemental Language in the 1979 Budget Act established a statewide Task Force, consisting of representatives from all segments, which developed this list of fourteen "core services":

1. Interpreter services
2. Reader services
3. Notetaker services
4. Mobility assistance
5. Registration assistance
6. Priority enrollment
7. Special parking
8. Facilitation of access to all programs
9. Access to special adaptive equipment
10. Referral to appropriate on-or off-campus resources, services, and agencies
11. Arrangements for specialized educational materials
12. Establishment and maintenance of a list of available readers, interpreters, notetakers, mobility assistants, and attendants
13. Supplemental orientation as determined by individual needs
14. Test-taking arrangements

The Task Force (a) recommended that campuses be allowed to use other resources to supplement these "core services," (b) left open the possibility that State funding for additional services might be provided; (c) reiterated the State's intention to cover the actual cost of providing necessary services; (d) called for the development of a long-term funding mechanism based on the cost experience in 1979-80.

---

## Problems with the "per capita" approach

Despite several reports and recommendations for such a funding mechanism, the Legislature has never changed the "per capita" approach begun in 1979, though adjustments have been made to account for inflation. Over the years, there has also been some fiscal recognition of workload changes for the California State University and the California Community Colleges, but not for the University of California. Further, it became increasingly apparent that the "per capita" approach is deficient in several ways:

- salaries and other operating expenses differ among the three segments;
- costs for programs with smaller numbers of students will be higher per capital because they lack economies of scale;
- costs associated with serving different kinds of disabled students vary enormously;
- the "true" costs of funding an adequate set of services for disabled students is difficult to establish because data suggests that an insufficient amount has been provided under the "per capita" approach. This means that the actual costs bear little relationship to the real needs since they reflect primarily the amounts available;
- there is no generally agreed-upon method of projecting the number of students to be served;
- an approach which relies exclusively on funding services only for students within the public institutions does not recognize at all the important role of private colleges and universities in providing educational opportunities.

In developing a long-term, stable, and adequate finance mechanism for disabled student services, we hope to correct these deficiencies.

---

## Questions for the public hearings

1. What are the strengths of the present system of financing disabled student services?

2. What are the weaknesses of the present system?

3. How are costs in the disabled students' program affected by changes in the institutional budget as a whole?

4. What role does collective bargaining play in determining the cost of services?

5. What principles should the State, as distinct from the systems or campuses, follow in funding services for students with disabilities? (For example, the principle of funding "core services" with segment-specific services provided in addition, or a common set of criteria rather than "core services"? Equivalent standards for cost and service comparisons? Flexibility? etc.)

6. What services are necessary for the successful accomodation of disabled students in order for them to complete their education at a postsecondary institution in California?

# 3

# *Evaluation and Accountability*

ASSEMBLY Concurrent Resolution 3 (Vasconcellos) has directed the ACR 3 Planning Committee to develop a mechanism to evaluate annually the progress by each segment in achieving the following goals:

A. The nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates eligible for admission to public four-year colleges, universities, and community colleges is similar to the composition of secondary school graduates generally.

B. The nondisabled-disabled composition of students completing vocational technical programs or transferring from Community Colleges into four-year institutions is similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of students entering community colleges.

C. The nondisabled-disabled composition of baccalaureate degree recipients from California colleges and universities is similar to the nondisabled-disabled composition of secondary school graduates who are eligible for admission to a four- year educational institution.

Two basic questions have been identified to organize the issues and inquiry associated with evaluation and accountability:

---

## Question 1: How will evaluation and accountability take place within each of the postsecondary education segments?

ACR 3 calls for each segment of postsecondary education to develop an evaluation system to assess its programs and services for disabled students. The evaluation systems will need to take into account the following:

### A. *Degree of commonality between segmental evaluation systems*

Each segment of postsecondary education will need to develop an evaluation system to assess its services for disabled students. While the principles and general process of the evaluation systems may be shared, each system will have to take into account the unique nature of the various postsecondary education segments. Evaluation of support services, for example, should be dependent on the mission, function, and population needs of the segment being evaluated.

### B. *Definition of nondisabled-disabled student ratios*

Current nondisabled-disabled student ratios should be clearly and accurately defined, depending again on the mission and function of the segment as well as the needs of the particular group of disabled students. Only through the use of such a perspective will we be able to establish valid baseline figures by which future goals for each segment can be established. In establishing these baseline ratios, each segment will need to take into account various barriers and limiting factors, outside the educational segment's control, that influence the participation of disabled students.

### C. *Overlap with current evaluation/accountability systems*

Unnecessary duplication of evaluation and accountability requirements should be avoided. The ACR 3 requirements should either include or be a substitute for existing evaluation/accountability procedures, such as the California Postsecondary Education Commission biennial report and the Community Colleges' DSP&S evaluation system.

---

## Question 2: How will evaluation and accountability take place for those recommendations of the ACR 3 Task Force which are not specific to the postsecondary institutional segments?

In reviewing and evaluating the implementation of ACR 3, limiting factors affecting the representation of disabled students which are outside the scope of postsecondary education will need to be considered. To reach these parity goals, which are the core of the Resolution, the Task Force will be making recommendations which will need subsequent evaluation. To do so, a simple evaluation system should be considered based on the establishment of goals with periodic measurement of their achievement.

A. *Setting goals/establishing critera*

Each of the recommendations in the ACR 3 report needs to include criteria for its evaluation.

B. *Setting timelines*

A timeline for gathering of data for evaluation as well as the timeline for analysis and follow-up need to be stated for each recommendation. ACR 3 states that an assessment of the implementation of the plan be systematically and formally reviewed on a triennal basis. Monitoring of implementation on an annual basis is desirable, with formal review on a less frequent schedule.

C. *Identifying responsible people*

Along with each recommendation, the agency(s) and department(s) responsible for the implementation of the recommendation should be clearly stated.

D. *Gathering data to see if goals are met*

The California Postsecondary Education Commission and the postsecondary institutions should agree on a method and schedule for gathering the evaluative data necessary for assessing statewide progress.

E. *Analyzing data*

ACR 3 states that the assessment of progress in the implementation of the ACR 3 plan shall be conducted by a Committee headed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission and composed of members representing the Department of Education and the three postsecondary education segments. Therefore, an intersegmental Steering Committee will be needed to follow-up on the status of the fulfillment of the goals of ACR 3.

F. *Drawing conclusions/ making recommendations*

An intersegmental committee will need to decide if recommendations have been satisfactorily accomplished or if they need to be altered, additional actions taken, etc. Continued involvement of an intersegmental group involved in Disabled Student Services, as described in ACR 3, is seen as essential to the eventual full implementation of the Resolution.

---

## Policy questions for evaluation and accountability

1. What are the common elements, for each of the postsecondary education segments, in the evaluation of services for disabled students? What criteria should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these services?

2. What criteria should be used to evaluate progress by the postsecondary institutions in serving disabled students?

3. How and where can accurate baseline data be obtained on the number of disabled students expected to enter and complete postsecondary education during the coming decade?

4. Where should the responsibility for coordination and monitoring of statewide efforts to serve disabled students be placed?

5. Where should the responsibility for evaluating programmatic and campus efforts to serve disabled students be placed?

6. What evaluation strategy should be used to monitor statewide progress in the implementation of the recommendations presented by the ACR 3 Planning Committee?

# *Written Testimony*

REMARKS PRESENTED BY ELIZABETH BACON TO THE CALIFORNIA
POST SECONDARY COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS
San Diego, California
June 22, 1986

Funding:

1) Current formulas do not provide funding for an adequate number of professional, full time, permanent positions needed to administer the core services required by existing policy. When the programs were new and the costs of services were unknown, this flexibility was seen as an advantage. At that time the Department of Rehabilitation and other outside agencies with their extensive staffs provided counseling services to students. When these same services shifted to the University, the need for professional staff was never recognized. These programs at the University are now more sophisticated and require regular consistent staffing with the level of professional training which was once only available through outside agencies.

2) Disabled Student Services in many ways performs a role similar to other Educational Equity programs. Yet as funding has become available specifically to augment these types of programs, funding for Disabled Students has not been augmented equivalently. This is important because D.S.S. programs not only contribute to University equity required under policy but are also the main programs helping the University to meet state and federal legal mandates.

3) In addition to funding for positions, the D.S.S. program requires adequate funds to provide direct services to students such as readers, interpreters and notetakers. These funds must be allocated on a formula which allows them to fluctuate in response to a) growth in the number of students served, b) regional differences in the cost of services, c) differences in the cost of services to some disability groups, and d) cost-of-living increases and increases generated as a result of collective bargaining by specialized service providers.

4) No appropriate policy exists to delineate who is responsible for providing services to disabled students enrolled in the University's Extended Education programs. Students enrolled in these programs are clearly entitled to services. However, D.S.S. programs are currently asked to provide these services but are not given funding to do so.

5) Funding formulas do not reflect the needs of the rapidly growing population of learning disabled students who require complex services coordinated by professional staff. Although the CPEC report of 1979 acknowledged the need for assessment, advising, tutoring and related services, these services have

never been funded. A permanent professional position is critical to providing support to these students.

Recommendations:

1) Establish a funding formula which allows for full-time professional permanent positions.

2) Establish funding which responds to the fluctuating costs of direct services allowing for regional differences, high cost of services, program growth and cost of living increases to service providers.

3) Students enrolled in Extended Education summer and winter sessions should be included in the funding formula.

4) Funding to establish policy and provide services to learning disabled students should be developed.

Evaluations:

D.S.S. programs welcome the development of an evaluation process. We recognize that similar programs are typically evaluated based on grade point average, retention and graduation data. We feel this kind of outcome data will be very positive once programs are fully funded. However, before this sort of outcome data can be meaningful, we must look at the systemwide and institutional policies and procedures which remain as barriers to students entering the system. These potential barriers include systemwide tests, admissions policies, physical access, financial aid resources, and academic policies and procedures. Policies, physical barriers and transition plans have not been formally reviewed by the postsecondary systems or by CPEC since they were developed.

A serious commitment to outreach and recruitment cannot and should not be made until existing barriers are removed and a strong service component has been established.

Recommendations:

1) CPEC should review all Institutional Self Evaluations (required under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) with particular attention to policies in the Academic and Student Affairs areas.

2) CPEC should require a formal review and update of institutional transition plans which were required under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Support funding to remove remaining architectural barriers especially

those which represent legal compliance violations.

3) Place people with expertise on disabilities, including disabled students, on each of the task forces and advisory committees which affect policy or services to all students.

Bailiff

*NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND OF CALIFORNIA*

*Student Division*

# TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION (ACR) 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 28, 1986

Mr. Chairman and Members of the ACR #3 Planning Committee:

My name is Michael Baillif. I am here today representing the Student Division of the National Federation of the Blind of California as one of its elected officers. We are a statewide organization of blind students with national affiliation. Our office address is 5982 South Land Park Drive, Sacramento, California, 95822. I thank you for the opportunity to speak here today and we of the NFB of California Student Division are pleased to participate in a plan to provide more effective educational services to disabled students.

The National Federation of the Blind has long been concerned with the academic preparation and support services accorded to the blind in secondary and postsecondary institutions through resource programs and offices for Disabled Student Services. We realize that a truly quality and comprehensive education is one of the keys to securing first-class citizenship, free of debilitating stereotypes. strive. Education, however, is a many faceted concept with many ramifications and considerations. The cornerstone on which education rests is the basic skills and self-sufficiency which must be developed and ingrained in secondary schools, if not sooner. For the blind, the primary skills of reading, writing, and mobility competency are matters of training and practice just as they are for any sighted individual. No great adaptations are needed for the blind student. We require primarily alternative technique instruction in such areas as Braille reading and writing, cane travel, and resource access, such as recorded books and Braille materials, etc. The time for this preparation is at the secondary level or sooner if possible.

Once a blind student has acquired the alternative skills, he is in possession of the tools of equality. In order to achieve this goal, however, these tools must be put to work by encouraging and even obliging a blind student to exercise his abilities and thereby practice independence. This is all that any outside service or agency has the responsibility or right to provide.

I would like to stress that for the blind an indispensable element of a quality education is autonomy. The skills of independence must be taught early and often and then the service providers must stand aside and let us utilize the abilities which we have gained. There is nothing more injurious to a person's intellectual and physical abilities than reliance and dependence on another for basic survival. This is a point which we would very much like to emphasize. The trend in services for the blind, especially in colleges, is for these programs to become far too expansive in scope and paternalistic in nature. As I have said, the blind need very few actual services. Anything furnished above and beyond the development of primary skills is in reality an extreme disservice.

To cite some concrete examples occurring throughout the California educational system, please consider the following:

> Disabled Student Services commonly employ staff persons, in some cases as much as 20 hours per week, for the specific purpose of calling an agency which provides recorded books known as Recording for the Blind. Independent blind students order their own textbooks from the agency. It takes them at the most 30 minutes per semester.
>
> It is not the function of the Disabled Student Coordinator to assume the role of speaking for the blind. That should be left to those of us who are blind and who have organized for the purpose. Unfortunately, coordinators have been responsible for negotiating the erection of audible traffic signals on campus streets and have pushed for the installation of tile edge detectors. These measures are, upon examination, quite unnecessary and extremely harmful. Instead of encouraging a blind student to utilize his skills and function on a par with his sighted counterparts, these contrivances place him in a protected environment and further separate the blind student from the normality which we seek. In addition, the more that unnecessary services are provided for the blind, the more the unfortunate notion of blindness as an insurmountable handicap is perpetuated and reinforced.

We would like to hold out as an example for services to the blind the Disabled Students Program at the University of Colorado. Blind students at this university receive appropriate guidance and instruction, yet it is the students' responsibility to provide for their own needs. Vans for the handicapped are off limits to the blind as we do not need them. And, such basic academic support services as readers are under each student's control. As a result of this obligatory independence, blind students emerging from the University of Colorado possess an immense advantage both in capability and confidence over those who are coddled and custodialized to the point of functional helplessness. This program, we would like to point out as a potential model to be both adopted and enforced throughout schools in California.

On a personal note, I would like to mention that I have spent a year in college at a private university which had absolutely no disabled support services whatsoever. The only assistance that I received was from the Department of Rehabilitation which paid for readers. This past year, I attended a state school which claims to have the most extensive and efficient Disabled Student Services in the state. Well, I am returning to the private college which, after experiencing both extremes, has in my mind the far superior Disabled Service System, that being no services at all.

A final point which must be brought up is the danger of placing too much emphasis on ratios and percentages of disabled-nondisabled students in graduating and entering classes. It is a laudable goal to seek to achieve equal representation of the blind in post-secondary institutions. Yet, this idea carries with it a grave danger. It is imperative that the blind increase their numbers in college by means of improved secondary school preparation and not through recourse to lower academic standards in post-secondary institutions. The result of such a disastrous occurrence would be that the worth of all degrees earned by blind students would be severely diminished.

By way of conclusion, I would like to restate the necessity of proper training of alternative skills at the secondary level. Once these skills have been adopted, the need for 90% of all special services then ceases. Self-sufficiency is a vital part of a blind student's education and without it a degree or diploma means virtually nothing. Therefore, when considering ways to improve the lot of the blind in education, please realize that we have not acquired through consolidation the inability to hear, or walk, or talk. We neither need nor desire to be subject to the inclusive services accorded those with all manner of other handicaps. We are blind, nothing more. Where the blind are concerned, better services do not mean more services but fewer services.

ACR-3 Summary f Testimony - Beverly K. Barrett
El Camino City College - May 23, 1986

Issue Addressed: Weakness of the Present System

Personal Background:

My name is Beverly K. Barrett. I am the Director of Disabled Student Services at California State University, Los Angeles. Prior to assuming the responsibility of this position, I was employed by the San Joaquin County Superintendent of Schools, Stockton, as a Program Administrator and Principal for a Special Education High School. In this capacity, I supervised programs which prepared some students for college. I look at my present position as an upward extension of much of my past efforts. I have a Masters' Degree in Special Education, Teaching Credentials in Learning Handicap, Special Handicap, and an Administrative Services Credential.

Issue to be addressed:

I would like to address weaknesses of the present system. I feel Disabled Student Services Offices are presently unable to meet the needs of the emerging and rapidly growing student populations with learning disabilities and post-brain trauma. I group these two populations together as there are similarities in their educational needs. Neither of these populations are new to society, but their desire and ability to pursue a university education is a recent occurrence.

During the past five years, Special Education teachers have changed their outlook regarding the future of learning disabled students. Students with learning disabilities are no longer counseled solely into vocational areas. College education is now seen as a viable training option for many students with a learning disability.

The post brain trauma college students are increasing in numbers. This increase is the result of more effective medical treatment. The medical treatment available to a victim of head trauma minimizes the effect of the trauma. These students have the potential of a more normal life, therefore, have the need and desire to obtain a college education.

Strategies to meet the educational needs of these two student populations:

In order to assure accommodation for these students, and to facilitate their success, I am suggesting the following strategies:

1) Individual program planning, coordination, adjustments, and monitoring
2) Individual learning strategies (how to learn) should be taught in order to facilitate self-accommodation of the student with LD during the time at college and more importantly, the future after college.
3) Facilitation of the appropriate accommodation within the existing campus auxillary services i.e. Career Center, Personal Counseling Center, Learning Resource Center, especially in the Study Skills Workshop.
4) Appropriate accommodations in academic departments. Academic faculty are especially in need of information about disabilities which are not easily distinguished or observable.

**What is needed to meet the needs of these two disability groups?**

The most important element of any educational program is the teacher. Staff with the appropriate education and training is necessary to assist the student and University in accommodation for these students. We need staff to assist in individual program planning and monitoring, to teach individual learning strategies and accommodations, to facilitate the development of skills within the auxillary services area and to provide faculty with information which will enable greater teacher effectiveness.

Before I entertain questions from the panel, I would like to comment on the issue of a funding model.

- I would like to see a funding model which would continue to provide flexibility to each program. I would like to be able to shift funds to other program areas when the needs of my students change. For instance, one year we may have a large population of visually handicapped students. I may wish to use funds to provide a specialist in this area. If the visually handicapped population declines, I would like to shift the funds to cover a different area of need.
- I would propose a larger fund allocation for disability groups requiring more extensive services.
- I would also propose safeguards to prevent encroachment of funds designated for Disabled Student Services.

# TESTIMONY GIVEN BEFORE THE ACR 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE
## WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1986

Good morning, members of the ACR 3 Committee.

My name is Sharon Bonney, and I am the Director of the Disabled Students' Program at the University of California-Berkeley, a position I have held since June 1979.

This morning I will give you my opinions about four specific issues surrounding the funding of disabled student programs at the University of California. The issues are:

(1) What constitutes a workable and equitable funding formula?
(2) What effect do federal funds have on our programs?
(3) What effect does our campus funding have on our budgets?
(4) What effect does DR have on our programs and services?

(1) Let me speak first to what constitutes, in my mind, a workable and equitable funding formula.

Since each campus program is at a different stage of development--some have been in existence for over 20 years, some have been in existence six years--it is difficult to pinpoint individual campus needs. However, we do have a universal need for a stable, base budget; a funding formula adequate to pay for basic services to students; and a responsive mechanism for fluctuations in funding needs.

I propose that the State consider providing a stable amount of money, which carries over from year to year, upon which a budget can be built. Campus directors and coordinators could be assured that this **baseline amount** would be available each year to pay their salary, to pay for clerical and support staff, and to pay for an office with telephones and necessary supplies. In short, there would be a disabled students' services office, the doors would be kept open, and professional staff would be available to assist students.

Adequate funding could come about, in part, by taking an **actual cost approach to direct services** given to students. It is obvious that the State will not allow programs to spend all they need and bill the State for it at the end of the year, but a system could be devised whereby specific services given to students, i.e., readers, notetakers, interpreters, lab assistants, etc., could be reimbursed dollar-for-dollar on an actual cost basis.

Our programs **will never have enough money to serve high-cost categories of students if we stay tied to a headcount per capita funding system**. The University of California has not received recognition of workload changes since the early 1980's. This means our actual per capita dollar amount received for each student is down to $365, based on 1984-85 student numbers. A full-time deaf student can cost an average of $4,000 a year or more. A blind student attending law school or some other graduate program could cost close to $8,000 a year.

The third aspect of a workable formula is that of a funding mechanism which can **respond quickly to a fluctuation in needed funding**. Under the current State funding system, I, as Director, must serve all qualified students who come to my office during an academic year. Next academic year my deaf student population will increase from three full-time interpreter-users to 13 users. On average, each student will cost my program about $4,000 for a total of $40,000 over this past fiscal year's expenditures. At the end of the academic year, I will report the number of deaf students served (in this case 13), and next fiscal year I will be "reimbursed" $4,745 (a per capita of $365 per student) for serving the 13 deaf students. Only one-tenth of my actual interpreter costs will be "reimbursed" under the current system.

There is no way my budget can respond to this large increase in interpreter users without going into deficit. What I need is a funding mechanism which can help pay for these large fluctuations this year rather than waiting until next year. I don't have a solution to this response problem, but I do hope the Committee will conceive of some mechanism to address this issue.

(2) Let me turn my attention to the effect of federal funds on our programs. Several campuses, Berkeley included, have been fortunate enough to receive federal monies under the TRIO programs. In Berkeley's case, these funds, totalling almost $90,000, pay for 25% of my counselors, 100% of my Project Director who screens, allocates, and pays for all auxiliary aid services, and 50% of our clerical help. Gramm-Rudman and the Washington attitude of a balanced budget, and the fact that the three-year funding cycle ends in June 1987, pose serious threats to our Program. Without these counselors and staff, our Program would be decimated, and the quality of services to students would decline drastically. Federal funds are paying for the provision of "core" services since the State pays only a little more than 50% of the University-wide costs. If the State doesn't help pay for the services provided by federal funds, our programs will go further into deficit.

(3) The third funding issue centers around the campus budget process and its impact on our programs. If the Berkeley campus imposes a 1.5% budgetary savings target on all programs, then the Disabled Students' Program has that amount automatically deducted from the budget. If the University says there is no inflationary increment during a fiscal year, then the Disabled Students' Program does not receive additional money for supplies and expense for that year. In short, our Program is treated the same as all other programs.

Our largest and most reliable source of campus funding to date comes from Registration Fees allotted to our Program through the budget process. The Student Reg Fee Committee, which recommends allocation of Reg Fees to the administration, has decided that the Disabled Students' Program should be removed from Reg Fee support. Their rationale is that my office provides academic services and should be funded by Educational Fees instead. The Committee also feels that it is the State's responsibility to cover actual costs of necessary services, and they are relieved of responsibility. If this attitude can develop on the Berkeley campus, it can develop on other campuses as well.

The shifting of disabled students' programs to Educational Fees is particularly distressing because there are fewer Educational Fees available to programs than there are Registration Fees. Programs funded by Educational Fees are in competition for those fees with powerful, academic departments. It is true that most of what our programs do is academic in nature, but we are perceived as a student service (therefore, fluff in many departments' eyes), and we would lose the battle for funding if we were up against academic departments or research functions of the University.

**(4)** Lastly, let me discuss, for just a moment, the effect of the Department of Rehabilitation on the Disabled Students' Program.

In 1979 the University of California began providing services to disabled students which had previously been provided to the students by the California Department of Rehabilitation. Rehab has been slowly withdrawing support from disabled individuals who qualify for their services. Students who apply to Berkeley are told that Rehab will not be able to sponsor them to the University of California because it costs too much. Students are told they will be sponsored to a community college, given the oppportunity to get a degree in a vocational area, or at most a terminal AA degree. If students do attend the University of California, Rehab will not provide reader services, tutoring services (in the case of students with learning disabilities), or other services, even if University funds are depleted. The original agreement in 1979 stipulated that the Department of Rehabilitation would provide services to their clients if University funds were unavailable. The net effect of Rehab's policies is that the number of students attending the Berkeley campus who are sponsored by the Department of Rehabilitation is declining yearly. Students are not given equal access to the type of educational institution they wish to attend but are told instead where they can go, and students are not getting the levels and types of services, in some cases, to which they are entitled. There is no cooperative, working agreement between Rehab and the Berkeley campus to ensure that students get the support they need. The campus has all the responsibility of providing services to students, whether they are Rehab clients are not.

In summary, I feel that the campuses are being squeezed from all sides in the funding issue. The State promises actual costs-- but none are forthcoming. The federal grants which have sustained some of us are in jeopardy of being dismantled in two months. Campus resources are becoming more scarce at the same time that our programs are growing and in need of more money. Rehab is withholding support for their clients attending our campuses. In essence, all parties involved are pointing the finger at the next person and saying, "They are responsible for funding your services," but no party is willing to shoulder the responsibility. We need an actual cost-funding model, and we need it soon.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF HARRIET M. CLENDENEN, COORDINATOR
DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

AT PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISABLED STUDENTS - ACR 3 - AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO, ON MAY 30

## INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The importance of ACR 3, in my mind, is not to standardize the programs for students with disabilities. These programs need to retain their uniqueness and their responsiveness to their particular student bodies.

I hope that the major result of this resolution will be increased cooperation among all segments of education in California. In too many cases, students--with or without disabilities-- have suffered from the lack of communication and reciprocity when moving from one level of education to another. We see this when students come unprepared from the public schools to higher education. We see it when community college students come to the CSU or UC system with dozens of units that are not transferable or do not know the advantage of general education certification.

If through the current ACR 3 process, we can lay the groundwork for mutual programs and cooperative efforts, we have succeeded.

We need to remember that the welfare of students and improving their opportunities for living meaningful lives is our goal.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS REGARDING FUNDING

1. What are the strengths of the present system of financing disabled student services?

The strengths of the present system are its flexibility and simplicity. We need to take care that we do not lose these qualities in a new system.

2. What are the weaknesses of the present system?

a. The length of the funding cycle (18 months from projection to receipt of funds) makes projections difficult and results in over-funding or under-funding. This could be remedied by partial funding at the beginning of the fiscal year with a reallocation on the basis of actual enrollment after the fall census date.

b. With only two permanent positions funded (director/coordinator and secretary), the present system results in inadequate staffing.

c. There is inadequate provision for high-cost students and none for extended education students. The large number of learning disabled students currently enrolled in the CSU system has had an extreme impact on DSS budgets. Also, the four CSU campuses with regular summer quarters have suffered from lack of funding.

d. Currently, there is no provision for the difference in regional costs, e.g., cost of interpreters in urban areas.

3. How are costs in DSS programs affected by changes in institutional budgets?

a. "Raiding" of DSS budgets has occurred on many campuses. Funds should be restricted. Other student populations are not affected as immediately or as dramatically as disabled students are, e.g., loss of support services such as notetakers and/or readers could result in a student having to leave school.

b. Disabled student support services are mandated by Federal law and budget language. Failure to provide them can result in the filing of grievances against the institution.

6. What services are necessary for the successful accommodation of disabled students in order for them to complete their education at a postsecondary institution in California?

The current basic core services, with certain additions, revisions and refinements, could continue to be utilized. There must, however, be consideration of the special needs of students in each segment of higher education, e.g., lower functioning students at community colleges and research-oriented graduate students in the UC system.

Additional services should include disability-specific tutoring, especially for sensory-impaired and learning disabled students. And, of course, there is need for assessment and retention services for the learning disabled population, as well.

In my opinion, outreach should receive only limited funding and should remain the province of Relations with Schools Offices, but personnel in this area should be trained as to the special needs of prospective students with disabilities. Also, some funds should be available for DSS staff participation in transfer center activities and for the visitations of disabled students to their former high schools or community college campuses.

I agree with previous speakers about the lack of qualified interpreters, especially in rural areas. Perhaps regional training centers for interpreters could be jointly funded by systemwide funds from all three segments of postsecondary education.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS REGARDING EVALUATION & ACCOUNTABILITY

1. What are the common elements for postsecondary education segments in the evaluation of services for disabled students?

   a. Are basic supportive services being provided?

   b. Are all programs of the institution accessible? Have attitudinal, as well as architectural barriers been removed?

c. Is admission possible for disabled students? Concern: new admissions standards for CSU may be discriminatory.

2. What criteria should be used to evaluate progress in serving disabled students?

Reasonable goals and objectives must be established by campuses with input from DSS staffs, disabled students and others concerned with the retention and graduation of these students. There is danger in using traditional measures such as GPA, unit load and the length of time necessary to earn a degree, due to the special population that is being evaluated.

3. How and where can accurate baseline data be obtained on the number of disabled students expected to enter and complete postsecondary education during the coming decade?

PROBLEM: The use of figures from secondary schools may be inaccurate, because:

a. Many students mainstreamed in the secondary schools are not identified as disabled.

b. Some postsecondary students become disabled following high school graduation.

c. The number of returning students over 30 with disabilities attending postsecondary educational institutions is larger than the average.

5. Where should the responsibility for evaluating programmatic and campus efforts to service disabled students be placed?

Evaluation should be placed in the hands of systemwide and campus advisory committees. Also, regular surveys of the "consumers" (students receiving assistance) should be conducted.

4. Where should the responsibility for coordination and monitoring of statewide efforts to serve disabled students be placed?

This responsibility should be placed with the systemwide offices with regular input from DSS staffs. One of the concerns of CSU coordinators/directors has been the lack of opportunity to meet and provide this input and to discuss current concerns.

In order to increase cooperation among the three segments, some type of joint advisory group should be established.

William B. Cutler, Area Coordinator
SELF HELP for HARD of HEARING PEOPLE
2590 Marshall Drive, Palo Alto, California 94303
Telephone: 415/326-2305 Voice/TDD

[Prepared for personal testimony during public hearing on Educational Services for Disabled Students before the ACR 3 Committee, California State University San Jose, May 29, 1986]

Members of the Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen

My name is William B. Cutler, 2590 Marshall Drive, Palo Alto, 94303. An increasing hearing loss, now profound, obliged me to take early retirement after two decades as Director of Business Services of the Foothill-DeAnza Community College District. I am now working, effectively full-time, as a volunteer for Self Help for Hard of Hearing People (SHHH), a national, nonprofit, educational organization for those who, while not deaf, do not hear well.

I do not intend to address all of the questions presented in the background material for this hearing since I am neither an 'educator' (in spite of my profession) nor a statistician. Rather, my testimony is intended to sensitize the Committee and its staff to the dilemma of those young people suffering "the invisible handicap", moderate to severe hearing loss, and the modest effort, individual and financial, required to accommodate that disability.

My first concern is related to statistics. Best available information suggests that about 8 percent (and growing because of noise abuse) of the general population have some degree of hearing loss. Data for California indicate almost 2 million hearing impaired, including 232,000 deaf and 957,000 hard of hearing (about 700,000 are considered to have a non-handicapping mild loss). I am certain that this proportion is not true among post-secondary students. Randy Jordan, coordinator of support services to deaf students at Cal-Berkeley, was quoted in my local paper just this week with the 'statistic' that "six deaf and nine (declared) hearing impaired students are currently enrolled and 10-12 deaf and 10-15 hearing impaired are expected in the 5000 entering class this fall."

[Let me clarify that the accepted definitions in use today, consider "hearing impaired" as the broad category which includes those who are "deaf" (the 10% who consider themselves members of the deaf community or sub-culture, probably using sign language) and the remaining 90% who are "hard of hearing".]

My extrapolation of Randy's figures results in a Fall '86 "deaf" population at Cal representing just .06% (six hundredths of one percent) and .08% "hard of hearing". Incidently, his data also suggest that the 'staying power' of hearing impaired students is very poor - presumably because of inadequate support services. There is no question that the percentages would be higher at Cal State Northridge and Ohlone College which both have an historic reputation for special accommodations for hearing impaired students, but I do not have their data.

Indeed, I suspect no one has accurate figures, for these or any other college. A major problem with those suffering hearing impairment is that many refuse to acknowledge their disability, let alone publicly announce it. This leads to neglect in the elementary and secondary schools (no hearing aids or special training in speechreading and coping) and therefore inadequate preparation for college. I have no doubt that there will be many highly motivated and/or intelligent hearing impaired students at Cal this fall that Randy can't identify. Unfortunately, there will be hundreds more who didn't make the grade in high school - and dozens who will withdraw without finishing their baccalaureate.

So, the problem is defined. What needs to be done? There are three basic accommodations which would be helpful to hard of hearing students (I am not qualified to speak for the deaf): (1) Faculty and staff training/sensitizing; (2) Assistive listening systems; and (3) Counseling in assertiveness and stress control.

(1) Understandably, because we have tended to try to hide our problem, the general public has little experience in accommodating us - and yet I have never been denied help when my need is known. Staff training, from registration clerks to food service employees, is a first step. It need not be extensive. Two pages in training manuals and ten minutes during individual or group training courses would suffice to orient a hearing person to techniques for communicating with hard of hearing students and boost tolerance for the inevitable misunderstandings.

Faculty, who rely on accurate communication to do their job, need more intense exposure through both general orientation and detailed training if (knowing or suspecting) they are teaching a hard of hearing student. I am talking about facilitating speechreading: good light on face, not talking to the chalkboard, assigning/allowing front row, center seating. Reasonably slow delivery is important since, even with electronic amplification and lipreading, we have to 'figure out' what we think we have heard, based on a few words and the speech pattern. Alertness to visible signs of lack of comprehension (standard procedure for a good teacher) is also important.

(2) Assistive listening systems (ALS) are very important, though not yet common. Ambient sounds such as coughing, conversation, air-conditioning, street noise and airplanes can be annoying to hearing persons. Because hearing aids amplifiy indiscriminatingly, they can ruin comprehension for the hard of hearing listener. Room reverberation and the high volume of even the best fidelity public address systems also destroy intelligibility for the hearing aid wearer. The purpose of an ALS is to 'connect' the speaker's mouth to the listener's ear, minimizing, if not eliminating, these problems. Three systems are available, all 'wireless'.

An audio induction loop, working on the principle of a transformer, feeds an ammplified microphone signal via a magnetic field to a telecoil in the hearing aid. An audio loop can be economically ($50 to $500) installed in most lecture halls already equipped with a public address system. It then can be used by any student having a "T" switch in his hearing aid. This system is very popular in Europe.

FM broadcast is, in effect, a miniature radio station with a transmitter at the lecturn and receivers worn by each hard of hearing student. Permanent systems can be installed in large lecture halls with PA systems. Receivers are loaned to students needing them. More practical, is a "personal" system consisting of a pocket transmitter worn by the instructor tuned to a pocket receiver carried by the student. It would be feasible for such a system to be issued to a qualified student each semester for use wherever his courses meet. A difficulty is that these systems broadcast as much as 200', so that different frequencies are required to prevent interference within a building. Such systems, called auditory trainers, have been in use by schools for the deaf for years. Foothill and DeAnza colleges have had them available in their disabled student programs since 1978. Personal systems cost around $500, while a permanent system with ten loaner receivers is about $2000.

Infrared broadcast is growing in popularity because its signal is confined to the room in use. A transmitter/emitter (video cassette size for *ad hoc* individual use, or wall mounted poster-sized for permanent installation) beams invisible modulated light waves to a receiver worn by the student. Personal systems cost under $500 with auditorium system with loan receivers from $2000-3000, depending upon size. A serendipity of the infrared technology is that all receivers can be used for any system, anywhere, from home TV to classroom to concert hall or theatre.

Students Opposing Unlawful Noise Deprivation (SOUND) of the National Law Center at George Washington University and SHHH have joined in legal action against the National Endowment of the Arts to require that ALS be provided at all performances subsidized by the NEA. Communication access is required under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 with Section 502 applying to federal buildings and Section 504 mandating it for buildings used for federally funded programs.

(3) The temptation is great for a hard of hearing person to become a recluse. It takes determination to overcome the self-image of inferiority and, sometimes, hopelessness for 'being with it' when you don't understand much, if anything, that is said. These feeling in turn build stress. Without authority, I would assume that special counseling, group or individual, would be productive toward the college (and career) success of the hard of hearing student.

I have made no attempt to propose a long-term financial strategy for providing these accommodations. Perhaps with my bias, I see no reason why they cannot be available within the next fiscal year for the minimal number of students involved. Certainly, the cost would be insignificant compared to the millions that have been spent for wheelchair access. My inexpert estimate is that provision of signing interpreters to one deaf student costs at least $10,000 each academic year, depending upon many factors, while we are suggesting a small fraction of that as a long-term, capital investment. A 1986 GAO report indicated that costs per hearing impaired student (majority are deaf) ranged from $12,415 at Cal State Northridge to $21,613 at National Technical Institute for the Deaf and $25,282 at Gallaudet College.

Accommodating - and encouraging - hard of hearing students in California colleges will cost a fraction of that!

Thank you for listening. I will be happy to answer questions and pleased to assist in implementation of my suggestions.

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

LEARNING SKILLS CENTER

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: June 12, 1986

TO: Bruce Hamlett
California Post-Secondary Education Commission

FROM: Susan Eiland-Rickman
Learning Disabilities Specialist

RE: Written statement of ACR3 Testimony on May 28, 1986, Public Hearing

To insure equal educational opportunities to the learning disabled student population, procedures and policies in three major areas need to be established.

1) Diagnostic assessment services need to be available on each campus. Trained professionals, i.e. L.D. Specialists or Educational Psychologists-Psychometrists, should administer and interpret the appropriate diagnostic tests. Academic and career advising should be founded on the individual learning profile that emerges from the interpretation of the diagnostic test battery.

2) Academic and basic skill (especially writing, math, spelling) tutoring should be available to students. On our campus, out of 90 students, 10 needed writing skill tutoring, 14 needed spelling tutoring, and 10 needed academic tutoring. Tutors need special training to deal effectively with L.D. students' learning needs.

   These two vital services need to be formally added to the core services list. In addition, any formula-based funding mechanisms should, of course, reflect the high cost of these services.

3) Educational policies regarding L.D. students need to be standardized and formalized in the the following areas:

   a) special admissions
   b) accommodations for entrance and exit tests; i.e., Writing Proficiency Exams, English and Math Placement

Tests (EPT/ELM)

c) curriculum requirement substitutions and/or waiver; i.e., for foreign language, mathematics and English requirements

Each campus now struggles independently to create policies that are fair and equitable. The Chancelor's position has been that each campus, in its autonomy, should deal individually with problems such as establishing reasonable accomodations for testing, course substitutions, waivers, etc. Experience shows that this lack of guidance has resulted in a very uneneven, and sometimes discriminatory, system-wide interpretation of the educational rights of the learning disabled.

As the system moves into full services to its L.D. student population there will be a need to standardize procedures for diagnostic assessment testing and identification of specific learning disabilities. Testing and identification procedures should be similar at each campus.

Any kind of formal outreach to the K-12 and community college systems should be postponed until program services are established and readily available on each CSU campus. The existing programs are based on precarious funding mechanisms which inhibit responsible planning. Until a sound funding base is established, CSU, Sacramento, cannot realistically move toward ACR-3's laudable goal of "bridging handicapped 12th grade students into the community college or four year institutions."

cc: Patricia Sontagg, Coordinator
Services to Students with Disabilities

Joe Aiello, Director
Learning Skills Center

THE SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

**San Diego City College**
DISABLED STUDENT PROGRAM
1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101 (714) 230-2513

May 22, 1986

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Description of:

1. Resources for Blind and Visually Impaired students at San Diego Community College District.

2. Coordination of services and community liaison with K-12 San Diego Unified School District. local rehabilitation agencies for the blind and disabled, 4-year university Disabled Student Services.

3. Department of Rehabilitation coordination to support student/ client Vocational Education Plans.

   Need for encouragement of clients to pursue educational programs which could lead to successful vocational goals. Entry level jobs are presently encouraged.

   Need for clarification of actual DVR services so students know what is available and when: i.e. Reader and Non-client Reader Services.

Helen Elias

Helen Elias
Specialist Instructor for
the Visually Impaired

HE:rs

Ana Garza
June 13, 1986

Problem: DSS programs do not promote independence.
Solution: Students would benefit best from a return to the voucher system.

Mr. Chairman and Members:

I learned early to fend for myself. Every first day of school, starting with junior high, I waited for a moment after each class, caught my teacher's attention, and made arrangements for the taking of tests. I took my own notes evolving from cassette to braille in eighth grade and understood the process by which to obtain readers and books in my sophomore year. I was ready for college survival crouched eagerly on the palm of my hand. But late did I learn that college was not the place for independence, that it offered too quickly and insistently the temptation of aid, that it stifled with superiority the desire to live and to work free from insecurity, and most did I learn that to grow we need change.

Of course, my theses, I base not on statistics or other more Scientific data, but rather I build it on the experience I have had as a student and the goals I wish to reach. I admit with all good honesty that my case is not common, yet I state with equal objectivity that the isolated incidence--unmet deadlines, inadequate execution of a service, poor communication--are by no means rare. I simply offer, Mr. Chairman and members, myself as a specific, as an individual like many others who want merely to succeed.

Thus inspired and having armed myself with the appropriate skills, I packed for college where I thought I would need them, but college was not the real world I found. "We provide readers, note-takers, and a proctoring service," I was told and understood that I was expected to accept them. I did not, however, scoop up the proposition as the Israelites had their manna. Why should someone else do for me what I could and should do for myself? What need could anyone have for this kind of institution? Nevertheless, I gave in, at the last, still reluctant yet secretly glad to have the load swept off my back.

And this acceptance gave me:

### Reading

Books: When the fall semester commenced, I purchased the six books my schedule demanded and dutifully passed five to the Disabled Student Study Center, the office responsible for reading and testing. Ten weeks later, five short weeks from the semester's end, I received two of my books; the first six chapters of a text containing seventeen came soon after; and the other two and two thirds tomes I received not at all.

The next semester I was wiser. I gave the Study Center only two of my books: A style guide for an upper division political science class which would not be needed for another five weeks and an English Composition's manual from which all class assignments and discussions would be drawn. The former was delivered two weeks after the first paper was due, disspite constant reminders. The latter I received in three installments: fifty pages after spring break; one hundred fifty pages two weeks before the semester's close; and four hundred pages one week before finals; This time, I consoled myself, the study center had completed its task.

Other Reading: Five times during the spring semester, I gave the Study Center hand-outs and twice a collection of articles. Each reading assignment I submitted, I accompanied with a reasonable deadline: three or four pages for something short (about ten pages) and a week or two for something long. Always on the due-date I was asked if I really needed that "today." Hence for the shorter material I usually returned an hour later than agreed which was not always a possibility, and the longer reading I simply accepted later than I had planned.

2. Research: In November of the first Semester, I requested research. For two hour periods on three different days, a DSS employee and I sifted through an enormous card catalog, compiling a list of the books I thought I would need. We did not consult periodical sections or even look on the shelves. The list having been compiled and stored in the employee's desk, our research was completed. There was nothing more to do.

3. Testing: Two tests ran into difficulty that year. The first, an exam taken early on the third day of finals' week, was received late which earned me an incomplete. Because of a bureaucratic mix-up, the grade was cleared late, and 181 dollars in financial aid were, until the last day of the following semester, withheld. In May, the second test, comprised solely of essay questions, was taken in braille to later be transcribed. As soon as I had finished, about fifteen minutes after closing, I placed the brailled answers where indicated. The next morning I received a phone call. The test could not be found.

Background provided, I begin my discussion.

I said, at the first, that college was not the place for independence. I referred, of course, to the Disabled Student Services as I see them, for when I started my college career assuming to have no help, I was soon given to understand that, although school policy was not, in theory, to handle the blind and handicapped merely by sending them to the campus' DSS office, it was so in practice. When I offered after several weeks of wait and inactivity to find readers for myself on return of books, I was told that my readers, those assigned to me, were reliable and that next week a tape would come in. When I asked for contact with my lectors, a message would suffice. When I wondered, politely and indirectly, how an office staffing five pairs of eyes working half- to three-quarter-time and controlling twenty-seven to thirty-eight readers could not meet its clients' needs, I heard about the complexity of running such an office. When I stagnated in a chair counting minutes frequently passed the hour until a service was performed, I saw employees chatting among themselves, with students, on the phone; planning social affairs not always related to the campus; finishing homework; leaving early for the day; eating food smuggled in from the nearest cafeteria; and promising that "later," "as soon as I get this done," "I'll get on it right away," the student's problem would be remedied. When I wanted help in paying for the readers I had found and books I had repurchased, Rehab was reluctant because "the Study Center takes care of that." When I talked to my professors explaining that my books were not yet ready, that I needed extra time, many, having experienced DSS disorganization, loaned me books and suggested readers while others assumed the going-on there were nigh sacred and I was somehow at fault. When I sat at the rear of my English class, unable to participate in discussions for which I lacked a book and hence the understanding derived from it, afraid of handing in papers at whose technique I had only guessed, ashamed of being there because I knew nothing of what went on, I cursed the Disabled Student Services sending them far beyond the devil. When I thought of the work, the time I had wasted, the money I had spend, the classes and readers I had struggled with on my own with only the hindrance of the handicapped office as an alternative, I felt defeated, tired, and angry.

I had been offered a service which I really had not much of a choice in accepting, a service which was excellent, which was for my own good, which was justified so many times; "Really, how else, but through the Study Center, could test security be maintained and professors not be inconvenienced?" I remember all the instances I spent in that fortress after hours and near my backpack, unsupervised. I think of the tests in high school which I took before class or in the hall or in a pigeon-hole of an office with an aid or with a student or with the teacher himself. "And really, how else, but with the Study Center, could students assure themselves of finding books in forms they require?" They post announcements in libraries, in classrooms, in dormitory entrances and bathrooms, in church bulletins, in shop windows, in volunteer bureaus, among friends.

They call RFB for books already recorded. They talk to professors to discover titles in advance and have RFB or some other organization produce it if they wish. "And really, how else, if not with more money, can we provide better staffing, more readers, etc.?" I recall my hardworking staff with this remark. I see them hiring someone new to do either everything or nothing. I think of the readers, most of whom ar volunteers, neither traced nor connected with the student.

I think, too, of the comments and the attitudes. "Don't cross at Cedar and Shaw. It's dangerous. You'll be hurt. ... Don't take German or Spanish. It's too hard: readering it. ... Don't take more math than you need to. It's too visual for the blind. ... Don't take classes in those buildings. They're too hard to get to. ... We can't just give you a list of readers and have you pick one. We know who these people are, what their interests are, what they might to read. We know their personalities. We know yours. We could choose best for you."

I frowned at these remarks. I am a declared Spanish major, and undeclared German major, and a mathematics minor. I live on campus closest to the Shaw and Cedar intersection which is convenient. If I need to go to a class, I will find the Hall. My readers are simply readers. Some I like and become friends with. Others are little more than strangers: they just say, "hello," pick up their, and read.

The general attitude makes me feel like a child, not mateur enough or sensible enough to be an adult. I am offered advice, suggestions, and warnings which make think I have a right to something better than my fellow classmates. At work, my Disabled Student Services will not be able to tell me what to do or where to go. When I transfer to a private college, I will have to work out on my own. Why should I expect what I am not entitled to? I need to learn to evaluate my short-coming and decide how to make them assets. The more practice I have the more time I will have to acquire my sea-legs, to make mistakes, to see what does and does not work.

A university would best help its students, not by giving them a convenience, but by allowing them a chance. All we, as students, need is a resource center and that only for a marker; a place for reading between classes; for using equipment--talking computers, optacons, close circuit televisions--which may not be available at home; a place for learning what RFB and similar organizations are and how to use them; a place for centralizing readers' lists for those students who have had trouble locating names or for those who have extras and can afford to share; for picking up vouchers; for testing if an instructor cannot offer another alternative. We need only a home base, a starting block from which the novice may begin.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and members, I say that I want control over my education, that because I am not like the rest of the job-seeking world, I must compete with them on their terms. I want to succeed, to be the best in my field, and to do that I must start early, in high school, in college, to find my own questions and answers. I need to learn independence as well as math and English for without it my degree means little

Ana Garza
P.O. Box 245 Earlimat, CA 93219
Testified at Fresno, CA, on May 29

Haley

**HEAD TRAUMA SUPPORT PROJECT**
SACRAMENTO AREA

# PROPOSAL FOR A HEAD INJURY PROGRAM AT A SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The University of California Davis Medical Center - the Trauma Center for Sacramento - sees, on the average, twenty cases of severe head injury a month! The effect of traumatic head injury on the injured and their families is devastating! Once productive young people, usually between fifteen and thirty years, suddenly find themselves unable to perform many tasks previously routine before their head injury.

After the acute care setting, with its' rehabilitation services of physical, occupational and speech therapies, the patient is discharged to his family or the community. However, impaired attention and concentration, memory disturbances, language problems and loss of reasoning skills prevent the individual from returning to his former activities!

For head injured adults and their families, recovery is a slow, expensive process. But more distressingly, there is a lack of programs available that deal effectively with cognitive retraining and resocialization.

As a representative for the Head Trauma Support Project of Sacramento, I was aware of this lack of services for the young people in our membership . My interest is also based on my personal observation through my 23 year old head injured son's present attendance at Sacramento City College. There is no learning disabled program there, and he must take regular classes conducted at a normal pace. He is at a great disadvantage and the limitations for him are very frustrating!

Presently, there are eleven Head Trauma Community College Programs already in existence in California....an excellent one at Coastline College in Costa Mesa, with an enrollment of 75 students and another at Santa Rosa Jr. College with about 18 people and a waiting list! Certainly Sacramento has a head injured population to warrant such a helpful program.

At Coastline College, for example, head injury classes are staffed by credentialed special education instructors assisted by instructional associates, aides, and volunteers. The classroom student to staff ratio is approximately 5 to 1. Additional program support services include neuropsychological evaluation, counseling, and assistance with job training and placement. A computer lab further individualizes instruction through the use of computer software specifically designed to facilitate the cognitive retraining of head-injured adults.

The need for such a head injury program is clearly there! Sacramento City College, with its' compact, accessable campus, would be a suitable location. The diverse ethnic population at City College lends itself to the head trauma population, which cuts a cross all classes of society with regard to resocialization. It is time that the school system acknowledges this type of disability and provides the means to allow young, head injured adults a second chance.

P.O. BOX 26315 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95826-0315
MEMBERSHIP - (916) 944-2889 • INFORMATION - (916) 989-4609
A Non-Profit
Community Corporation

Haley

COASTLINE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

# THI ENROLLMENT CRITERIA

Coastline's THI Program is a demanding educational program designed to prepare students for vocational training and placement, continuing education, and/or community independence. Applicants to the Program must be goal-oriented and committed to achieving maximum independence. As Program space is limited, priority consideration is given to those applicants deemed by the Admissions Committee to have the greatest potential for success within the THI Program.

Applicants should meet the following eligibility criteria:

1. Students must be high school graduate or over 18 years of age.
2. They must have sustained a head injury on or after the age of thirteen.
3. Candidates must possess sufficient self-help skills for control of basic bodily functions.
4. They must be medically stable.
5. They must provide own transportation to and from classes.
6. They must have sufficient receptive and expressive communication skills to benefit from the rigorous educational program.
7. They must be free of blatant psychosis and/or behavioral problems which require physical restraining or which would adversely affect progress in the Program.
8. They must have been free of dependency on non-prescribed drugs (including alcohol) for a minimum of one year at the time of application to the Program and remain dependency free throughout enrollment.
9. They must be willing and able to participate fully in the Program and the Individual Educational Plan.
10. The student's family and/or significant other must be willing to participate in the Orientation Program and in the student's Individualized Educational Plan.
11. They must be ready to commit to full time participation in an individually prescribed educational program.
12. They must be willing and able to adhere to all college rules and regulations.

7-12-83

Haley

HEAD TRAUMA SUPPORT PROJECT
SACRAMENTO AREA

## WHAT IS HEAD TRAUMA?

Head Trauma is a head injury resulting from an auto accident, a blow to the head or a fall. The results can be devastating and permanently disabling.

The patient may become comatose and require life saving surgery to the brain. In severe cases, there is an insult to the central nervous system. _If_ the patient regains consciousness, he often is left with contractured limbs, paralysis, damaged eyesight, hearing, and balance, a memory loss (often permanent), impaired or no speech/communicative skills, and sometimes epileptic seizures. His thinking processes are usually slowed and disrupted. He may be permanently confined to a wheelchair, and in worst cases, persist in a vegetative state in bed. He may also suffer personality and behavior changes. He may be unable to work.

These horrendous problems, singly or combined, create a tremendous strain on the family or person struggling to support and secure rehabilitation services for their head injured loved one. It can lead to resentment and the eventual breakdown of the family. Even those head injured persons who are walking about and talking may, in fact, be more handicapped than a paraplegic in a wheelchair with an intact brain. Some families care for cases at home, like Karen Quinlan, who need total care. Others, like the case of the former Press Secretary, James Brady, are securing rehabilitation to achieve the greatest potential possible.

OVER

P.O. BOX 26315 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95826-0315
MEMBERSHIP - (916) 944-2889 • INFORMATION - (916) 989-4609
A Non-Profit
Community Corporation

# WHAT IS THE HEAD TRAUMA SUPPORT PROJECT, INC.?

The Head Trauma Support Project, Inc. is a volunteer non-profit organization run by the families of serious head injury patients. It was founded in 1979 by family members who felt the lack of a support system, referral source or information center in the community at that time regarding head injury.

Under the guidance of an advisory board composed of doctors and other professionals, we assist persons of traumatic brain injury and their families to improve the quality of life by reduction of stress and the exchange of information about head injury and rehabilitation. We also offer socialization and education for families through rap sessions and lecture meetings twice a month. We also have educated the community through our co-sponsorship of a "Traumatic Brain Injury Conference" with U.C. Davis School of Medicine and the Easter Seal Society. This conference was our original idea and we secured the help of UCD and Easter Seals in putting it on. From one of our conferences, we produced and have sold an 18-hour video training program to hospitals and clinics nation-wide to help spread the word about head injury care to professionals. We have assisted many families and therapists interested in starting similar support groups in distant locations. We have given lectures to hospital staffs, participated in health fairs, worked with other groups (MADD, Bereavement Network, Alzheimer's Aid Society), assisted with volunteer work, and spoken to various civic groups. We have had several fundraising events, including a symphony concert.

Our current membership is approximately 100 families which includes persons residing in counties adjacent to Sacramento. There is no similar service available in Sacramento County and the surrounding area. We serve and receive calls from all over California and correspond with related groups and individuals all over the U.S. and the United Kingdom. Our over-all goal is to ensure that the head injured persons will receive quality, continuous care. WE ARE COMMITTED TO THE GOAL OF ENABLING THE HEAD-INJURED INDIVIDUAL TO ACHIEVE THE HIGHEST HUMAN POTENTIAL POSSIBLE.

Haley

**HEAD TRAUMA SUPPORT PROJECT**
SACRAMENTO AREA

## HOW EFFECTIVELY DOES THE ENABLER PROGRAM SERVE THE LEARNING DISABLED?

There is a common assumption among the general studentbodies and even the community at large, that the Enabler Programs, located at the three Community Colleges of Sacramento, serve the needs of all the handicapped students on campus.

In fact, the Enabler services provide for the physically handicapped, but do not allow for the learning disabled. Yes, they do provide tutors and note takers, who are recruited from the general studentbody, with little or no training in learning disabilities.

The courses offered to the learning disabled on campus are regular college courses conducted at normal speed for regular students and do not allow for the problems of the learning disabled, such as impaired attention, and concentration, memory problems and reduced reasoning skills. The handicapped student may be even pulled out of the classroom and tutored on his own, isolated from other classmates.

Why is it that Sacramento is one of the few areas in the whole state of California that does not endorse a learning disabled program at even one of the three Community Colleges here?

Even the instuctors, qualified tho they may be to teach the average student, may be at a loss to deal with the specific problems of the learning disabled.

I feel this lack is a disservice for students with learning disabilities who are certainly being discriminated against by such a policy.

P.O. BOX 26315 • SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95826-0315
MEMBERSHIP - (916) 944-2869 • INFORMATION - (916) 989-4609
A Non-Profit

To: Bruce D. Hamlett, Government and Public Affairs
From: Martha Hansen, Graduate Student, CSU

My name is Martha Hansen. I am presently working on my MA and specialist's credential in special education. At the age of two I was diagnosed as having Werdnig-Hoffman, a rare neuro-muscular atrophy condition. This condition affects my muscles, causing them to be very weak. It is progressive in nature as well. Due to the severe lack of strength I was unable to spend much time in public education. My school district provided home instruction for me from second grade through high school graduation. The intention of the high school I attended was to prepare its students, academically, for being able to meet entrance requirements and attend any university in the UC system. Although I did not regularly go to classes, I was prepared (having taken the appropriate classes) to meet the requirements in order to enter a postsecondary school.

Initially I attended CSU Fullerton. The special services I received included a waiver for taking the SAT test and priority registration for myself and my driver(s).

After three years I transferred to CSU Fresno to finish my degree and to begin to live independently. After two years I completed my degree in Linguistics. The special services that I received there were primarily advisory in nature. Advice, in regards to independent living, e.g., how to work with governmental agencies, hiring/firing procedures for attendants...

As mentioned previously, I am back at CSU Fresno working on two credentials and my MA in special education. The special services that I receive/utilize include: extensive use of the study center's facilities, e.g., use of the computer, special arrangements for testing...

I appreciate being able to use these facilities. Although until recently I have not made use of many of these services I feel that the existence of them is important in assisting myself and others in becoming more proficient in class assignments and allowing me to retain my independence.

As with many others who have exceptional circumstances, I require physical assistance with such tasks as lifting heavy references, opening card catalog drawers, and retrieving books, magazines, and abstracts. These tasks are possible to accomplish but very time-consuming and emotionally stressful when I am not accompanied by an assistant. During my undergraduate work, I attempted to perform all of my assignments on my own efforts and was continually frustrated. Presently, I fully utilize any assistance of the disabled student services here at my university. I feel as though these services have been extremely beneficial to me psychologically and physically. Due to the workload of the personnel involved in the program, much of my assistance I have needed to fund personally , i.e., hiring a research assistant to work at hours when program personnel are unavailable. It would be extremely beneficial if services could be extended so that a person like myself who used the library in the evenings and on weekends could be accommodated without personal expenditure.

I require approximately four hours a week of special assistance. My research assistants help me do research, type while I dictate the text, photocopy.... Just as some students need several hours of reading a week, I need personal research assistance. If funding would permit, this would be a great benefit to many students, I am sure.

As mentioned previously, I really appreciate the services that are offered. Hopefully this letter will benefit your committee in its decision concerning ACR 3.

Sincerely,

Martha Hansen

## ACR-3 TASK FORCE TESTIMONY

I, Julia Haraksin, M.S.W., would like to present myself from both a personal perspective as a woman with a congenital physical disability and as a professional in the field of higher education. I was educated in the California public schools and am now employed by the University of California at Irvine, in Disabled Student Services. I would like to address a couple issues.

The first issue I find of major concern relates to the problem of student preparation to enter post-secondary education. The students who attend post secondary curriculums arrive from several different preparations; from "totally" mainstreamed situations, to "selectively" mainstreamed, to totally "isolated" environments. In order to understand my perspective it must be first stated that I was educated in the El Rancho Unified School District of the Greater Whittier Unified School Districts in the County of Los Angeles. The students from this vast area were all funnelled into the Special Classes for students with disabilities. The Junior and Senior High experience included "selective mainstreaming". This involved encouraging the individual students to participate in all the "regular" classroom curriculums that they could on an academic level and to utilize the special service classroom for classes that they needed special attention. The outcome of this program allowed all the students with disabilities to be mainstreamed with the non-disabled students as much as possible, and yet provided a community of students who understood their specific disability needs.

In my professional experience, these students are the best prepared to enter and succeed in the post-secondary education environment. They have had the opportunity to complete the college preparatory courses offered by their high school and yet do not feel as "different" as their counterparts who do not have the support of a special service office to use for their unique academic, physical, and developmental needs. They may have had to tolerate a "special" designation but conversely, they have been afforded academic accommodations and a social support system.

Most of the students who have been "totally" mainstreamed and attempt to enter post-secondary institutions have deficient academic accommodation skills. (e.g. profoundly hearing impaired students who have never been exposed to American Sign Language; learning disabled students who have not been encouraged to explore alternative information processing skills, such as Books On Tape vs. reading their texts.) They also lack the emotional "back-up" system of other students with disabilties and the sense of belonging to a group which is so critical to the adolescent. The self concept of these students is also unpredictable, many of them have felt alienated by their peers and have chosen to either withdraw socially or assert themselves, sometimes forcibly.

On the other end of the spectrum the students who have been isolated, in special schools for their specific disability, find it difficult to meet the ever tightening post-secondary education admissions requirements. They also lack the social skills of their peers due to the lack of social contacts that occur in the academic setting.

The second issue that I would like to address stems from my two and a half years experience as a Community-Based Advocate of the Client Assistance Project. This postion entailed mediation and advocacy on behalf of the clients of the California State Department of Rehabilitation when there were difficulties between the client and the Department. One of the major frustrations that I encountered was the reluctance of the Department to sponsor the academic ambitions of their academically motivated clients. In compliance with the Department's legislative mandates, they are empowered to assist those with disabilities who will, with reasonable expectation, benefit from rehabilitation (i.e. training, assistive devices, and career refocusing) and who will then most likely be employable once a cost efficient rehabilitation has been completed. The rationalization of the Department now being used to direct clients away from post-secondary educations is that the State and Federal regulations only allow the Department to support the "entry level" preparation.

The definition of "entry level" is the issue in question. The regulations require that the Department consider many elements of the clients life such as aptitude, interests, skills, and financial need for fiscal independence. But what is occuring in the Department of Rehabilitation counselor's office between the counselor and the clients is the clients say they want to go to college and the counselor has already determined, despite the client's post-secondary aptitude and severity of disability which translates into financial need, that the Department will only pay for the student to attend a five month training program that will eventually pay just over minimum wage. What is the client going to do when they are working, have substandard health insurance coverage and they have exhorbitant health care costs? For many of the clients I encountered as the Community-Based Advocate, this question not only discouraged the client from the consideration of entering the workforce but also financially and pragmatically prevented them from considering a post-secondary education.

The opportunities for post-secondary education are slowly becoming less available and yet we now have a growing source of innovations that are enabling those of us with disabilities to participate with fuller access than ever before. I look forward to the data and information this committee acquires through these testimonies and hope that through a joint effort of all of us concerned with education we are able to assist in the enabling of students with disabilities.

Heller

THE SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

**Educational Cultural Complex**

4343 Ocean View Blvd., San Diego, CA 92113 (619) 230-2842 TDD 263-5300

Disabled Student Services

TESTIMONY AT ACR 3 HEARINGS, SAN DIEGO, MAY 22, 1986

My name is Anne Heller and I am an Associate Dean for Disabled Student Services at the Educational Cultural Complex, which is a continuing education site of the San Diego Community College District. A large portion of the students served through this office are developmentally disabled and enrolled in our off-campus program in conjunction with the San Diego Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC). The Community College provides a viable and essential service to these students, and the type of educational programming has changed over the years. The current trend is towards community-based work training leading to competitive or supported employment and independent living.

This change in programming is also taking place at the K-12 level, where developmentally disabled students are being involved in community-based training at an early age. Due to a push from organizations such as the Association for the Severely Handicapped (TASH) and from University Special Education Teacher Training programs, more students are being prepared for supported work and more independent life styles. The Community College must meet this need by providing a continuum of services and involving students in community-based vocational training and independent living skills instruction. This will result in their successful integration into the mainstream of society, including supported or competitive employment, and improved quality of life.

There are the beginnings of existing institutional efforts to enable smooth transitions from secondary to post-secondary programs for developmentally disabled students. Committees are already established to promote better interaction and open communication between these two segments. This is vital as the focus in programming changes. Traditionally, developmentally disabled adults have been served in segregated settings, and their vocational options included attendance at a sheltered workshop. The Community College is currently establishing a "track record" of serving these students in new ways and in continuing the types of programs started in the K-12 system. Through the use of non-credit, continuing education classes, we are teaching vocational and independent living skills in on and off campus settings. Some programs are still located in segregated facilities, but through the improved student/teacher ratio provided by Community College instructors and instructional aides, we are able to take small groups of students into community agencies and businesses to provide work training in real work settings. Other programs, located on campus or in local churches, provide ILS and enrichment classes as well as work training. The improvement in students' self esteem and work skills has been marked, and has already resulted in the competitive employment of several students. Other students are involved in supported work or serving as independent volunteers in local agencies. The end results of these instructional opportunities are a greatly improved quality of life and entrance into a "normal" work force composed of disabled and non-disabled workers.

To further underscore the significance of this new trend in programming, a bill has been introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman Steve Bartlett which would include a definition of supported employment in the Rehabilitation Reauthorization Act of 1986. This would also include supported employment as an acceptable employment outcome for persons with severe handicaps who seek training through the State Vocational Rehabilitation System. Mr. Bartlett defines supported employment as "competitive work in integrated work settings for individuals with severe handicaps for whom competitive employment has not traditionally occurred, and who, because of their handicap, need intensive, ongoing, post-employment support services to perform such work. Supported employment shall include individuals with severe handicaps and shall involve work sites in which non-disabled individuals are employed." This bill must be approved by the full House of Representatives and Senate, so no final decision is yet available. However, one can see that there is a national trend towards the provision of these services to developmentally disabled persons.

My suggestions for the future include the following:

- improved articulation with the K-12 system to provide smooth transition for developmentally disabled students into the Community College system, and then from school to work,

- establishment of more community college and continuing education classes in on and off campus settings to provide community-based and independent living instruction,

- maintenance and improvement of access for developmentally disabled students to community college classes.

I hope that this information has been of assistance to you. Please feel free to contact me if I can provide you with any further information.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Heller

Anne Heller
Associate Dean
Disabled Student Services

AH:ib

Hughlett

CERRITOS COMMUNITY
COLLEGE DISTRICT

Wilford Michael, Ed. D., President-Superintendent
11110 E. ALONDRA BOULEVARD
NORWALK, CA 90650-9973
(213) 860-2451

June 3, 1986

Mr. Bruce Hamlett
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Hamlett,

While attending the public hearing relative to ACR-3 at El Camino College last week it struck me that the attached document may be of interest to the group. It is a listing of generally "uncontrollable" variables that impact the transfer rates of disabled students from the community colleges to the four year systems.

The sheet was composed three months ago for the Transfer Center Advisory Committee at Cerritos College.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bob Hughlett

Bob Hughlett, Ed.D.
Supervisor
Programs for the Disabled

BH/hw

# VARIABLES THAT MAY AFFECT THE TRANSFER OF DISABLED STUDENTS

VARIABLES:

1. Many disabled students feel geographically bounded by the local community because of dependence (or perceived dependence) on family and familiar resource networks. Transfer to Colleges and Universities would generally require movement outside of these self-imposed boundaries and would result in accompanying discomfort.

2. Significant numbers of disabled students are pursuing vocational programs, especially one year certificate programs, and have no desire to devote additional time to study before entering the job market.

3. A marginal student who is doing average work, even with full support of the community college disabled student program, may be academically unable to make the transition to the University.

4. For significant numbers of disabled students, the dream of a college degree does not extend beyond the A.A. level.

5. Many disabled students enrolled at this community college receive financial support for their education through the State Department of Rehabilitation. Except in extraordinary circumstances, this agency provides for the cost of training for entry-level positions only, and would not offer support to the student for the third and fourth years of college study.

6. A student who is considered permanently disabled and is receiving monetary support in the form of SSI or SSDI, etc., is generally unwilling to jeopardize these payments, either by becoming a full-time student or by training for substantial gainful employment. Thus, being a part-time non-transfer student is the ultimate goal for many of these students.

7. Because many disabled students are dependent on accessible public transportation, it is unfeasible for them to consider transfer outside of the service area of their local municipality.

8. The limited scope (as perceived by disabled student) of support services at four year schools certainly provides at least a psychological hurdle to their consideration of transfer.

Remarks in Response to ACR3
Tom Humphries
May 22, 1986

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I am an Associate Dean of Special Education with the San Diego Community Colleges and I work specifically with Deaf and Hearing Impaired students. I have been working with Deaf students in post-secondary programs for 14 years here and at Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C..

During my experience it has become clear to me that Deaf students come to and graduate from colleges and universities when those colleges and universities offer equal opportunity and equal access. However, I have seen equal opportunity defined in many ways. The one that is most common and the one that is guranteed to fail, is the definition that all that needs to be done for Deaf and Hearing Impaired students is to provide sign language interpreters and notetakers. While these two services are much used and much needed by some Deaf and Hearing Impaired people, the majority of Deaf people who are of college age and have the ability to succeed in post-secondary programs do not get equal opportunity from these two services alone.

Giving a Deaf person an interpreter and throwing them into the mainstream is like giving a physically disabled person a motorized wheelchair then throwing them on a campus where there hasn't been any curb cuts or ramps built or electric doors installed. Learning through an interpreter takes skills that go way beyond what a typical non-Deaf student must develop in order to make it in a college or university. I have had that experience in my own education and know well that the barriers to success in college are not overcome by a sign language interpreter. I would like to briefly list some of the other factors that contribute to making success possible.

First, there must be peer support. For Deaf people this means other Deaf people. This peer support must be on campus. Often the Deaf person on campus today is alone or is one of two or three Deaf people on campus. So what I am saying is that the goal of ACR3 to increase representation of Deaf people on campus is, in part, it's own solution. Deaf people are both recruited by and helped by the presence of other Deaf people. The reason is simple, Deaf people figure out ways to make the system work for them and they share this with other Deaf people. This information for how to succeed cannot be gotten from any other source than from Deaf peers or from Deaf professionals working on campus.

This brings me to the second factor. Deaf teachers, counselors, and administrators working with Deaf students is the surest way to guarantee that Deaf people will come to a college, stay there, and graduate. Deaf professionals on campus along with Deaf peers form a kind of cultural presence on campus which opens up the system in ways that cannot be achieved by non-Deaf professionals.

For example, and this is the third factor, these Deaf professionals are using the Deaf students' language, which in many cases is American Sign Language. Many Deaf students who come to college are going to need some help with English because for them English is a second language. The way to address this need is not necessarily to put Deaf students into remedial English classes, but sometimes to put them in classes where they can use their first language ASL to learn English as well as other basic skills which they will need as they are studying in mainstream classes.

Fourth, Deaf students on the college campuses need advisement and counseling and the need it in their own language, ASL. Trying to get counseling through an interpreter is often more of a problem than the problem the student brings to the counselor to solve. Counseling is an essential part of the support system that Deaf students need to succeed on campus but it has to be in a form that Deaf students can actually benefit from. This means professional counselors who are themselves Deaf or who have excellent skills in American Sign Language.

What I am arguing for here is for a recognition that an interpreter, as precious as one is to a Deaf person on campus, is not the solution. It is not enough to guarantee the equal access many places and many committees before this one has wanted to think it is. Equal opportunity can only be achieved by several program components:

1. Interpreters

2. Notetakers

3. Auditory equipment

4. Teachers and counselors who are skilled in ASL in a support role to the mainstream program.

5. Deaf peers on campus in sufficient numbers so that each Deaf student who comes to the college doesn't have the burden of reinventing the wheel each time and worse, doesn't have the burden of teaching the people in the system while trying to learn. The way a Deaf person gets through the college and university system is different from non-Deaf students and, therefore, can get limited support from non-Deaf peers.

I think the strategy a college must adopt to reach the ACR3 goals is this:

1. Hire a professional staff which can provide instruction, counseling, interpreting, notetaking, and all the other services I just mentioned directly through fluent ASL and hire as many Deaf professionals as possible.

2. Have these professionals do four things:

a. develop a way of assessing students academic and support needs including testing for basic academic skills,

b. develop and teach classes that support students with basic skills, while they are mainstreamed into the college program,

c. develop a tracking system that allows for monitoring and advisement and creates the Deaf presence that students so badly need on campus,

d. and recruit students from secondary programs directly in their own language.

This strategy is simple and can be summed up in a few words: Deaf people on campus will create for Deaf students the real equal opportunity that we talk so much about. Deaf people know what needs to be done and how best to do it and the smartest thing we can do as policy makers and administrators is to make sure that Deaf people have the opportunity to show other Deaf people how it's done.

Thank you for listening. I'll be happy to answer any questions about this very involved topic. I have a handout of a very brief article I wrote on this subject. Thank you.

you, and when others express affection to you? How do you feel when you intimidate someone, when you make a demand on someone, when you refuse a request, when you reject someone, and when you express affection toward someone?

Expression of affection is rarely dealt with in assertion training, but ironically, it can be a most threatening event for the learning disabled. The threat is the recalling of painful incidences when the need for affection went unmet, and the burning sense of how difficult it has been to successfully repress such unsatisfied desires. The same step-by-step principles apply to the development of assertiveness in this area as in the other areas of hierarchical threatening situations.

It is important for the instructor to understand that almost any " I am . . ." or "I do . . ." statement is an assertive statement. "I am afraid and I want to leave" is an assertive statement. "I am angry when I can't read" and "I feel less than you when I can't remember" are assertive statements. They are assertive because in order for the person to know that fear, anger or inferiority is being felt, the person must first become aware of these feelings, and then feel "okay" about expressing them. Genuine statements should be encouraged and developed by the instructor by emphasizing the good reasons for being afraid, angry and feeling inferior.

It is hoped that the above presentation has brought about an expanded concept of assertion training by interweaving it with the areas of identity and issues related to the learning disabled adult.

## References

Barsch, R. Achieving perceptual-motor efficiency. *A space-oriented approach to learning.* Seattle: Special Child Pub., 1968.

Bergantino, L. *Psychotherapy, Insight and Style. The existential moment.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1981.

Buscaglia, L. *Living, loving, learning.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston. 1982.

Canter, L., & Canter, M. *Assertive discipline.* Los Angeles: Canter & Assoc., 1978.

Cordell & Phillips. *Am I OK?* Illinois: Argus Communications, 1975.

Dennison, P. E. *Switching-on.* Glendale: Edu-Kinesthetics, 1981.

Osman, B. *No one to play with.* New York: Random House, 1982.

# Planning and Evaluating Culturally Sensitive Post-Secondary Educational Programs for Deaf People

*Tom Humphries*
*Associate Dean*
*San Diego Community College District*

---

## Abstract

*This position paper analyzes assumptions underlying the planning and evaluation of post-secondary educational programs which are often incomplete and/or misinterpreted for Deaf people. Deaf people are identified as a disabled group and as a cultural group. When mainstreamed into hearing post-secondary programs, the cultural and linguistic difference of Deaf people is often overlooked. An understanding of the nature of Deaf people's linguistic abilities can change the kind of programming for instruction of English. Deaf people have perspectives, values and behaviors that differ from those of hearing persons. Educational program(s) must become culturally sensitive in order to be effective. The kinds of questions to be asked in evaluating a program for Deaf students relate directly to whether or not the program achieves this sensitivity. A listing of references on this topic have been presented in the "Listings of Materials Consulted."*

---

## Planning and Evaluating Culturally Sensitive Post-Secondary Educational Programs for Deaf People

In planning and evaluating an educational program, a starting point is the basic assumption that forms the operating basis for the program. An educational program for a specific population of people is based on certain perceptions of these people and their needs as well as the kind of program that is best suited to meet these needs. This paper will concern itself with the underlying assumptions which are used to build post-secondary programs for Deaf* people. From all indications, it seems that the basic assumptions upon which programs for Deaf college students function at present are valid but incomplete and limiting to program planners who try to use existing programs as models for establishing new programs.

---

*The capitalized "Deaf" is used when referring to cultural aspects, as in Deaf culture. The lower-case "deaf," on the other hand, refers to non-cultural aspects, such as the audiological conditions of being without hearing. The capitalized "Deaf" does not include hard of hearing or other deaf people who are not and do not consider themselves as part of a Deaf cultural group.

An examination of these assumptions reveals the following: 1) Deaf people can be categorized with other disabled people, 2) Deaf people can be mainstreamed into post-secondary programs, and 3) Deaf people have certain basic support service needs that must be met in order for them to succeed in post-secondary institutions, which include sign language interpreters, notetakers, tutors, special counselors and special classes.

These assumptions are not only incomplete but also, the way they have been interpreted may not be accurate. They do not, for example, say anything about the dual identity of Deaf people. In recent years, it has become clear that Deaf people have a dual identity as a disabled group and as a cultural group using a different language. Therefore, it is necessary to add to the foregoing assumption (number 1) that Deaf people can be categorized with other disabled people, but they should also be recognized as a linguistic and cultural minority.

It may be that some post-secondary programs for Deaf people are operating under this revised assumption without knowing it. For instance, when a program includes a special consideration for the English skills of Deaf students, it shows it recognizes tacitly that a difference exists between the language of the educational system and that of the Deaf person. However, this difference is misunderstood when it is believed that the Deaf student's difficulty with English is the same as that of other students who need remedial English classes in order to succeed in college. Remedial instruction is for those individuals who have internalized the rules of the language and may speak it without difficulty, but who are unable to read or write it with the same accuracy. Since the first language of Deaf students is American Sign Language, they have internalized the rules of this language and use it without difficulty. Therefore, English is a second language and Deaf students do not require remedial instruction but, rather, developmental instruction. Developmental instruction assumes that an individual has not yet mastered the rules of the target language, which indicates that the need that post-secondary Deaf students have for English instruction is akin to that of English as a Second Language (ESL) students. Akin, but not exactly the same, because certain aspects of the ESL approach to not hold true for use with Deaf adults. How to handle the language situations of Deaf students is the most obvious area of concern for most program administrators and staff. But there is another area of concern that is equally important but much more difficult to understand and act upon. This is the cultural aspect of Deaf people. Padden and Markowicz (1976), Markowicz and Woodward (1975), and Padden (1980) suggested that there is a Deaf cultural group with separate values, behaviors and language from the general hearing culture. While most people seem to accept this without reservation, it is hardest to know exactly what the differences are. A listing of the difference in values between the two cultures, Deaf and hearing, is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is important to understand that the differences are real and go very deeply. A good example of these differences can be found in how the two groups use their respective languages. In English, a hearing person uses

73

the term "deaf" or "hard-of-hearing" to refer to someone who is different in a sensory way. The "hard-of-hearing" person is less sensorily different than the "deaf" person. The terms "deaf" and "hard-of-hearing" in English usage refer to degrees of hearing loss.

On the other hand, in American Sign Language (ASL), a Deaf person uses the term "deaf", or "hard of hearing", sometimes to refer to degree of hearing loss but more often to refer to cultural orientation or identification. Someone who is "a little hard of hearing" in ASL is almost Deaf but *behaves* a little like a hearing person. Someone who is "very hard of hearing" is someone who behaves very much like a hearing person. This is in direct contrast to the English usage of the terms by hearing people.

While all this may seem very abstract, the consequence of ignoring it in everyday life is very real since a genuine cultural difference and, unfortunately, sometimes a serious cultural conflict exists. It is not just a difference in the two languages that can be cleared up with a simple explanation. It is rooted in value systems that get more and more complicated as one examines them.

How do these cultural differences have a bearing on program planning and evaluation? They have a direct bearing on the assumption mentioned earlier that "Deaf people can be mainstreamed into post-secondary programs." Indeed, they can be, but only "if the programs are culturally sensitive." The question becomes, "What considerations must be made for a culturally sensitive educational program for Deaf students?" There are many considerations, three of which are examined.

## Language

The first cultural conflict that is likely to occur is between the Deaf person and the system. Deaf students are confronted with a system (the college or university) which is an English speaking system. In assumptions 3 and 4 mentioned earlier, the answer to this problem is a number of support services, including interpreters. It only requires a very basic sampling of the language used by most "sign language" interpreters to show that, for the most part, interpreters provide a service of "making English visible," rather than actual translation from language to language. It is neither appropriate for programs to assume that their interpreters are doing language-to-language translating nor to charge interpreters with the responsibility of solving the language difference between the system and the Deaf student. The task of "simultaneous interpreting" that is assigned to interpreters almost without exception requires the interpreter to follow the English word order of the speaker, and since American Sign Language has a separate and different grammar from English, the result is a kind of "signed English," not American Sign Language.

While it is not fair to the interpreter or the Deaf person to exaggerate what the interpreter actually does, it is appropriate to recognize the essential function interpreters provide in the program. What actually happens in most interpreting situations is that sign language interpreters serve as a way to make English partly visible so that Deaf people can use their knowledge of

English to understand what is being communicated.

This means that with or without an interpreter Deaf people are faced with the language difference and the accompanying possibility of cultural conflict due to incomplete and ambiguous understanding of each other's language. Using an interpreter is a skill that a Deaf person may or may not have.

Language use plays a part in another kind of cultural conflict that arises. Often, the English-speaking system blames the Deaf person for a lack of proficiency in English and places him/her in the category of "educationally deprived," "culturally deprived" or "language deficient." The situation for Deaf people is more like that of a person from another country who may not know English well but is in no way deprived in the language, education or culture of the other country. A Deaf person's problems with idiomatic usage in English is often used to point our their "language deficiency." But it would be more appropriate to say that the lack of proficiency in English idiomatic usage comes from the fact that Deaf people are from a different culture. Idioms are very culturally dependent. It is little wonder that someone not in the mainstream of the culture would have problems with them.

The difference between thinking that someone is deficient and thinking that someone is culturally different is the basic kind of sensitivity which needs to go into planning and evaluating programs for deaf individuals because it facilitates functioning across cultures.

## Training

Functioning across cultures is a skill that requires experience and training. Whenever industrialists, diplomats or even Peace Corps workers are assigned to work in another country, they are given training, sometimes intensive training, in the language, the values and the behaviors of the people with whom they will work. This is for good reason. The effects of American insensitivity to foreign cultures is well documented and almost a legend in some parts of the world. There are compelling reasons for providing the same kind of training for program staff and the Deaf people in an education program that will mainstream Deaf people into a hearing culture. Not only is there the need not to offend people from another cultural group, but there is also the need to avoid making program decisions based on inadequate understanding of the people for whom the program is intended. The model that is selected on which to base parts of the program will determine whether or not the program is ultimately culturally sensitive.

This can best be illustrated by example. In most educational programs for Deaf people, there is a provision for academic, career and personal counseling services. Sometimes, there is special counseling service with a counselor trained in sign language who is supposedly trained to work with Deaf individuals. Other times, the Deaf student must take a chance with an untrained counselor through an interpreter. Whichever the case, rarely is this counseling based on a cultural model. To be sure, most counselors who work with Deaf students are probably aware that a difference in language and culture exists. Few seem prepared to act upon this knowledge. To be fair, counselors are rarely trained to counsel a cultural situation when confronted with one. If asked to work with a non-American, the counselor will realize that part of the problem may be a cultural conflict and will react accordingly by informing concerned parties and by exploring ways to resolve the conflict.

Rarely will a counselor think culture when confronted with cases involving Deaf persons. Given this lack of association of Deaf people with cultural differences, the inclination is to think in terms of other types of conflicts, such as personality conflicts, or to assign to Deaf people as a group certain characteristics that contribute to a conflict, such as "not goal oriented." Characterizing people in this way is not new. It happens to most cultural minorities in America, including native Americans, Chicanos and Blacks, as well as historically to Deaf people.

If a decision is reached that "a personality conflict" or "not being goal oriented" is the problem in a case involving a Deaf person, then efforts to work out a solution will proceed on this decision. If that is really the problem, then there is no reason why a solution will not be found. But if the problem is an unrecognized cultural conflict, and efforts are focused on something else, the problem will never be solved to anyone's satisfaction. In fact, misguided efforts at a solution may compound the problem.

It has been noted that Deaf persons prefer Deaf counselors. The reason for this is not based solely on language. Being "more comfortable with one's peers" translates into a shared culture. But even Deaf counselors will need training in coping with cultural differences if they are to be effective in their roles. For the counselor and all program staff, it is not enough to know there are two cultures involved --skill is needed when two cultures meet.

## Cultural Access

On most campuses, there are few staff and personnel, especially teachers and counselors, who are of the Deaf culture and language. In other words, there are few who are Deaf themselves and use ASL as their first language. In most places, there are probably one or two who sometimes make all the difference in the world for the Deaf student.

Imagine traveling in a far country without benefit of a common language where the culture is very different and not understood. The traveler might feel a discomfort born of the inability to interact fully with other people and eventually acutely miss the native language and culture. This is a very frequent occurrence for people who take long trips and encounter other cultures. It is not hard to imagine the relief of meeting another traveler from the same culture. The pleasure of hearing the native language and the ease of interaction based on shared life experience would be tremendous.

For Deaf students, the presence of Deaf professionals on campuses resembles the traveler met on the road mentioned above. In trying to travel through the hearing and English speaking system, a Deaf student may look to other Deaf students, but he/she will get great relief from Deaf professionals. The reason for this is that the Deaf professional brings de facto bicultural education to the campus. By de facto, it is meant that bicultural (and bilingual) education is happening in reality to some extent, even if it is not realized or recognized.

By having Deaf teachers teach special classes (such as English) using American Sign Language, a program is made accessible to the Deaf student using the student's own culture and language within the system—not an adjunct to the system. It is a favorite theme of Deaf folklore that a successful Deaf person can often point to a Deaf person in the past who helped provide the turning point for success.

There exists a need to have Deaf culture present and accessible in the educational program. Black and Chicano Studies programs are a foregone conclusion at most colleges and universities. Classes in which Deaf people can study American Sign Language and Deaf culture are rare indeed. Yet, just as hearing people need English classes, Deaf people need American Sign Language classes. Just as hearing Americans are required to study their culture in History, Government and many other classes, Deaf students need to have access to study their own culture. It is extremely ironic that many colleges and universities regularly offer American Sign Language and Deaf culture classes to hearing sutdents, but rarely design classes on the same topics for the people to whom they belong—Deaf people.

Finally, the aspects of program planning in language and culture also extend to program evaluation. The questions that need to be asked when the time comes to evaluate the effectiveness of a program include the following:

Does the program provide language instruction that is appropriate for a population that has a first language different from English (an adult, developmental program)?

Is the staff trained not just to know but to understand and cope with a culturally different group?

Does the program provide bicultural, bilingual access (a Deaf presence on the staff)?

And finally, does the program have the ability to keep up with the speed at which we are discovering new things about Deaf people (is information made available to the Deaf students in courses that relate to them as Deaf people)?

These questions may seem radically different from those usually asked of programs for disabled students, but they represent the difference between other disabled groups and Deaf people. The difference is a very positive one. The perception of Deaf people as a linguistic and cultural group is not only accurate but infinitely more productive.

## Listing of Materials Consulted

Baker, C. *On the Other Hand: New Perspectives in American Sign Language.* New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Baker, C., & Padden, C. Focusing on the non-manual components of American Sign Language. In P. Siple (ed.), *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research.* New York: Academic Press, 1978.

77

Baker, C., & Padden, C. *American Sign Language: A Look at its History.* Maryland: TJ Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Baker, C. Sentences in American Sign Language. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Battison, R. *Lexical Borrowing in American Sign Language.* Maryland: Linstok Press, 1978.

Battison, R. Signs have parts: a simple idea. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Bellugi, U. How signs express complex meanings. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Cogen, C. On three aspects of time expression in American Sign Language. In L. Friedman (ed.), *On the Other Hand: New Perspectives in American Sign Language.* New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Fischer, S., & Gough, B. Verbs in American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies,* 1978, *18,* 17–48.

Frishberg, N. Arbitrariness and iconicity: historical change in American Sign Language. *Language,* 1975, *51,* 676–710.

Jacobs, L. *A Deaf Adult Speaks Out.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Press, 1969.

Kannapell, B. Personal awareness and advocacy in the deaf community. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. *The Signs of Language.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Lane, H. *The Wild Boy of Aveyron.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Lane, H. Notes for a psycohistory of American Sign Language. *Deaf American, 30,* 3–7.

Liddell, S. Non-manual signals and relative clauses in American Sign Language. In P. Siple (ed.), *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research.* New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Markowicz, H., & Woodward, J. Language and the maintenance of ethnic boundaries in the deaf community. A paper presented at the Conference on Culture and Communication, Temple University, Philadelphia. To appear in *Communication and Cognition,* 1978.

Meadow, K. Sociolinguistics, sign language and the deaf subculture. In T. O'Rourke (ed.), *Psycholinguistics and Total Communication: the State of the Art.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1972.

Padden, C., & Markowica, H. Cultural conflicts between hearing and deaf communities. *In Proceedings of the Seventh World Congress of the World Federation of the Deaf.* Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1976.

Padden, C. The deaf community and the culture of deaf people. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community*. Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Supalla, T., & Newport, E. How many seats in a chair? The derivation of nouns and verbs in American Sign Language. In P. Siple (ed.), *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research*. New York; Academic Press, 1978.

Trybus, R. Sign language power and mental health. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community*. Maryland; National Association of the Deaf, 1980.

Wilbur, R. *American Sign Language and Sign Systems*. Maryland; University Park Press.

Woodward, J. Historical bases of American Sign Language. In P. Siple (eds.), *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research*. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Woodward, J. Sociolinguistic research on American Sign Language: a historical perspective. In C. Baker and R. Battison (eds.), *Sign Language and the Deaf Community. Maryland: National Association of the Deaf, 1980.*

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • FRESNO

[illegible]

[illegible]

June 6, 1986

Bruce D. Hamlett
California Postsecondary
  Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA  95814

Dear Bruce:

It was a pleasure meeting you at the ACRB Testimony session in Fresno last week. Currently, I have two students working with Weldon Percy on program design and implementation.

As I promised, I'm including comments regarding appropriate service/education for disabled students at the postsecondary level.

There is a tendency to regard the state and the university as two separate entities separated by a no-man's land. They toss budget requests back and forth with occasional accountability demands by state personnel into the affairs of the university. This model is too simplistic!

The no-man's land between the state and university has been occupied by an array of coordinating boards, governing agencies and multicampus systems. It is not simple to describe where the state ends and the university begins! However, both the state and state university have distinct roles; a constructive relationship between the two demands a system of checks and balances that recognize these different roles.

Universities need sufficient freedom and flexibility to achieve quality and to preserve freedom. They also need a sufficiently active external force to ensure that the university meets the needs of the public, that it performs competently while remaining dynamic and ever changing as society changes.

To provide quality education/service to disabled persons in postsecondary education requires a commitment beyond the so-called reform movement in higher education. In general, the reform movement is translating into a business approach to higher education, i.e., how do you push the greater number of students (F.T.E.) from the front door to the back door in the shortest length of time and at the least cost? There's very little concern about the quality or breadth of program because these concerns interfere with the number game!

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Bruce D. Hamlett
June 6, 1986
Page 2

With few exceptions, disabled students are receiving limited services in the C.S.U.S. With an estimated number of 34,000 in the system (i.e., 12% of the student population) @ $465 for each disabled student served, the annual state budget for these services (if all eligible students are included) there should be sufficient dollars to operate an efficient program. Somehow, I doubt that this funding exists!

Research has revealed that over 70% of the "Learning Disabled" are 17 years of age, or older. There are numerous reasons for this, including neurological damage from vehicular accidents, drugs, strokes, etc. Another problem is that there is a lack of prepared personnel with the expertise necessary to provide education and services for the "Learning Disabled" at the postsecondary level. Preparation programs for Learning Handicapped Specialists exist in the C.S.U.S. for the K-12 population. Because the needs are different (e.g., life-career preparation, marriage-family planning, etc.). A specialized preparation program is needed. In addition to the Learning Handicapped Specialists, tutors are needed to provide one-on-one special services.

There is a unique need for inservice of faculty, staff and counselors on each campus serving the handicapped. It does not logically follow that these personnel are prepared to modify, adapt, and adjust their programs and services appropriately. One specific need is for career counseling and advising. Finally, there is a need for outreach (extending into the community) and transition (preparing for life in the community) through interfacing with business and industry and agency services.

If you wish clarification on any topics covered herein, don't hesitate contacting me - Mornings (209) 294-2468
Afternoons (209) 226-5721.

Sincerely,

Gordon F. Johnson, D.Ed.
Professor, Department of
Advanced Studies
School of Education and
Human Development

GFJ:dgs

cc: Homer Johnson, Dean, School of Education and Human Development
H. Dan Smith, Chair, Department of Advanced Studies

**CalSACC**
The California Student Association of Community Colleges

*Serving California's Community Colleges*

Roland L. Jones, Chairperson
Disabled Special Interest Committee

CalSACC is a state-wide student organization.

My concern is for that of the Learning Disabled (LD) student. At present the LD population is not being provided for adequately in any level of education. Since learning disabilities are hidden disabilities, the needs of such students often go unnoticed. A person may be severely disabled, but show no obvious outward signs of having a disability. One study has stated that approximately 17% of the population is affected with some form of a learning disability. This is thought to be a conservative estimate, however one can only guess at numbers because of the many who have not been diagnosed. Learning disabled students are not retarded, most generally they are of atleast average intelligence. Unfortunately, a nondiagnosed or nonprovided for LD student may appear to be of below average intelligence. Without the proper guidance and attention these students are subject to being placed into the ranks of the below average student. Unrecognized he/she may become discouraged from achieving low academic standing and withdraw from college. In essence, they become casualties of a system that is unable to meet their needs or who are ignorant of learning disabilities all together. The loss of these student is unnecessary. It has been proven that with the proper assistance an LD student can achieve academic success.

A system needs to be set up so that LD students can be identified prior to enrollment at a post secondary institution. It is of the utmost importance that LD students are identified before placing them into the mainstream of the student population. An unidentified LD student faces multiple barriers and is subject to many derogatory stereotypes. It is very common to lable an LD student as being a "slow learner", "stupid", "dumb" as well as various other terms. These things do very little to help build one's academic confidence.

In order to offer the necessary programs that identify and provide for the LD student a means of stable funding must be arranged. Adequate funding is the key to a successful learning disability program. Currently the only California Community College district (Los Rios CCD) that does not provide for the LD student lists insufficient funding as the reason for not providing any services. This year the state is once again cutting funding to LD programs. Will other districts go the way of the Los Rios CCD ? Without stable funding there is no assurance that LD programs will continue from year to year. The issue of a more sufficient means of funding is one that must not be overlooked.

In closing I would like to reiterate the following two concerns that I feel must be addressed.

1. Identify LD students prior to post secondary enrollment. If they enter the mainstream of the student population they are subject to academic failure.

2. A means of stable funding needs to be provided. A successful and prosperous program cannot be provided unless it has proper funding.

Thank you for your time and patience.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISABLED STUDENTS - ACR 3

WRITTEN TESTIMONY
CINDY KOLB
JUNE 11, 1986

## BACKGROUND

Funding for CSU DSS programs is based on the projected number of regularly enrolled disabled students, with a specific formula used to determine the estimated deaf students enrollment. Through formulas, the amount of funds for services and staff are determined. Currently, Extended Education students are included in enrollment reports but not in data for budget purposes. Budget projections are calculated 18 months in advance and no provision exists for adjusting funding if a DSS program has a higher actual enrollment than was projected. Further, DSS funds, which were once protected because of their specific use for services mandated by federal and state enactments, now may be diverted for other purposes on campus unrelated to programs for disabled students.

## ISSUES

The current funding approach for CSU DSS programs poses several problems for implementing required services to disabled students. First, formulas for staffing patterns have not been revised although the enrollment of disabled students systemwide has grown from 3230 in Fall 1981, to an estimated 5358 in Fall 1986. Accompanying growth in enrollment is increased responsibility for service delivery as of Fall 1981 when the charge for provision of reader and interpreter services transferred from the Department of Rehabilitation to DSS programs. Although the Department of Rehabilitation had professional counselors who coordinated these services, formulas for DSS staffing were not updated so that funding could be available to hire appropriate personnel. In essence, the directive for delivering reader and interpreter services was transferred to CSU DSS offices without additional professional personnel to implement this mandate.

Second, the projection process has penalized DSS budget when a program has grown more than anticipated. Since projections used for budget purposes are completed 18 months in advance, actual enrollment figures may differ from projected levels. No method exists for the revision of projected enrollments to reflect actual numbers of students. As a result, if enrollment is underestimated, a DSS program may encounter serious budget shortfalls which no longer can be corrected since no systemwide reallocation process exists. Reallocation funds were unavailable in 1985-86, and previously were distributed on a limited basis. Subsequently potential fiscal resources that existed systemwide from overfunded programs could not be diverted to underfunded DSS offices. Ironically, funds specifically identified by the legislature for disabled students - and needed for that purpose by various DSS offices - are now not available. San Francisco State University, for example, has a large enrollment of disabled students who use costly services, such as readers, tutors or interpreters, plus Extended Education students who are entitled to DSS resources but who are not part of the program's funding base (see attachment). Our office, therefore, faces deficits, staff layoffs and reduction in services. In contrast, overfunded programs are not required to return excess funds and may have their surpluses used to meet other campus needs outside of services for disabled students. Protections that had restricted expenditures of DSS funds only for identified services no longer are upheld. With these fiscal inequities, funding for services is unpredictable and, concomitantly, the access of disabled students to postsecondary education is compromised.

Third, the inadequacies of the funding formulas are also apparent in the widening gap between the costs of complex services and available funds to meet these expenses. For example, the formula for funding deaf students is calculated by dividing the total unit load of all regularly enrolled deaf students by 15. The resulting figure, or Deaf FT 16, is multiplied by $4,000 to determine the funding level for interpreter services.. It is assumed that a campus will only need part of this allocation for interpreter expenses, with the remainder to offset reader and other support service costs. This funding approach becomes increasingly limited each year since the $4,000 is a static allocation. No increment in the amount funded is made even though interpreter pay rates have risen. The cost per student FTE for interpreter services, however, can quickly exceed $4,000 during an academic year, especially if a student is taking graduate or technical/professional courses. Deaf students enrolled through Extended Education may also require services that must be absorbed by the program and can be costly. No adjustment is made in the funding formula to allow for higher costs that a graduate or professional student may incur or for a specific type of interpreting skill that is required. Further, determining Deaf FTE on a 15 unit load misrepresents the actual unit load taken by deaf students, especially for those enrolled in graduate school or professional programs where a more realistic unit range may be 9 to 12 units. Finally, regional differences are not reflected in this formula, although urban campuses may have more interpreter expenses due to the higher salary ranges in these geographical areas.

Fourth, although Deaf FTE funds are allocated for interpreter salaries, the allocation is made in Contractual Services, which is a non-employee account. As stated previously, the Deaf FTE formula specifies an allocation which remains the same each year, with no adjustment made for increased cost of services. In order to use the Interpreter/Trans-literator Class 7170, interpreters are hired through Temporary Help and so funds from Contractual Services must be transferred to this account. Serious budget problems arise, however, when cost of living increments occur; interpreters in the 7170 classification are miscellaneous employees who automatically receive cost of living increases at the same rate as clerical employees. Since our funding for interpreters comes from a non-employee account, our budgets receive no augmentation for this expense; Chancellor's Office only provides cost of living funds to salary accounts. From 1984 through 1986-87, approximately 18% in cost of living increases have occured which could drastically drain fiscal resources of a DSS program. Placement of interpreter funds in Contractual Services poses further problems in that this account does not allow for wages to be paid in a timely manner. It is not unusual for payment through Contractual Services to take six to eight weeks to process which makes employment of interpreters on a regular basis almost impossible. It is clear that funds to be used for interpreter salaries should be allocated in a salary account so that the appropriate classifications can be used and wages paid on a realistic timeline.

Fifth, current funding formulas do not reflect the needs of the rapidly growing population of learning disabled students who require complex services coordinated by professional staff. Appropriate assessment, counseling and advising, and competent support service providers, including readers and tutors, are critical to the retention of qualified LD college students. Funds for essential accommodations and qualified professionals are not identified in the present budget process so that DSS programs have responsibility for another major service area that is not appropriately funded.

Sixth, no recognition is given for the regional differences and varying fiscal needs which accompany particular populations of disabled students. Urban campuses in high cost areas may have greater service expenses than a rural University. This discrepancy is recognized, for example, by the CSU in a cost differential for travel where Humboldt may have a greater allocation for travel because of its rural location than an urban campus. Housing allowances for Presidents also acknowledge the increased cost of living in certain geographical areas. No similar process is available for DSS funds although support service costs may vary due to regional factors. In addition, the demographics of the disabled student population impacts the availability of funds for services. A program with a large deaf, LD and visually impaired (VH) student enrollment will have more costly service requests than a comparably sized campus with a large mobility impaired population. The actual size of the disabled student population appears to be less of an influence on program expenses than the number of students in particular disability groups who use expensive services.

In summary, the major budget issues encountered by DSS programs in the CSU are:

1. A lack of funding formulas for permanent staff positions.
2. An inability to revise budget projections to reflect actual enrollment.
3. The removal of protective language for DSS funds.
4. The inappropriateness of Contractual Services as the account for interpreter funds.
5. The lack of a reallocation process to provide underfunded programs with the funds equal to their enrollment level.
6. The exclusion of Extended Education students from the DSS funding base.
7. No provision for the impact of regional differences on budget resources.
8, Inadequate provisions for the impact of high cost services related to specific disability groups.
9. The lack of fiscal support for the expanding LD population.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to resolve the above issues, five recommendations are offered:

Recommendation 1

Funding formulas should be revised to provide resources for professional staff and the appropriate level of services. A systemwide committee of DSS Directors, Budget staff, disabled students and other identified individuals should be coordinated to develop funding formulas.

Recommendation 2

Initial funding for DSS programs should be allocated during the beginning of the fiscal year, with budget adjustments made based on Fall VDE. A contingency fund should be established for unanticipated enrollment growth in the spring term.

Recommendation 3

DSS funds should remain protected to be used only for services for disabled students.

Recommendation 4

Disabled students enrolled through Extended Education should be included in VDE data for funding purposes; data should be gathered subsequently for summer and winter sessions.

Recommendation 5

A cost differential for support services should be established to supplement programs in high cost-of-living areas.

## SUMMARY

In terms of funding, it is apparent that growth in the enrollment of disabled students and provision of services critical to the retention of this population are not desired. Certainly, discussion about outreach to prospective disabled students is ludicrous if current funding precludes a campus, such as San Francisco State, from meeting the varied needs of students with impairments. The Chancellor's Office, CPEC and the legislature must decide if a commitment to the access of disabled students to the CSU system exists and then affirm that commitment with appropriate funding.

Thank you for reviewing this testimony.

Cindy Kolb, Ph.D
Disabled Student Services
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132
(415)469-2472

## ATTACHMENT

### Verified Disability Enrollment (VDE) Reports*

### Disabled Student Services-San Francisco State University

| Year | Semester | Visual | Commun | Mobility | L.D. | Other Functional | Deaf | Deaf FTE | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1981 | Fall | 50 | 11 | 112 | 18 | 51 | 3 | 2.4 | 245 |
| 1982 | Spring | 48 | 7 | 129 | 15 | 61 | 6 | 4 | 266 |
| 1982 | Fall | 47 | 1 | 144 | 16 | 48 | 11 | 7.6 | 267 |
| 1983 | Spring | 42 | 6 | 168 | 17 | 59 | 11 | 9.1 | 303 |
| 1983 | Fall | 50 | 6 | 152 | 20 | 46 | 16 | 11.3 | 290 |
| 1984 | Spring | 47 | 7 | 185 | 24 | 47 | 15 | 12.7 | 325 |
| 1984 | Fall | 50 | 9 | 174 | 44 | 45 | 18 | 14.2 | 340 |
| 1985 | Spring | 50 | 8 | 230 | 55 | 33 | 20 | 16.5 | 396 |
| 1985 | Fall | 46 | 9 | 172 | 68 | 40 | 23 | 14.8 | 358 |
| 1986 | Spring | 42 | 9 | 184 | 70 | 35 | 24 | 16.9 | 364 |

---

* Does not include extension and special programs, plus people who requested confidentiality

Kolb

## COMMENTS ON ACR 3 MAY 30, 1986

I wish to address the planning committee today as a representative of the Directors of Disabled Students Services Program at California Community Colleges for Region 5. I will base my comments on the questions asked in the agenda materials sent to the field.

### WAYS OF IMPROVING THE ACADEMIC PREPARATION OF DISABLED STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS, IF UNDERPREPARATION RESULTS FROM THEIR DISABILITY

> 6. What activities and techniques are needed to better counsel and inform disabled students to appropriately support their aspirations to college?

I have been providing counseling services to Disabled Students Services Programs for 12 years. In that time it has become apparent the major obstacle to success in college is the dependent attitude that a majority of transfer students from K-12 seem to exhibit. This dependent attitude is a result of social isolation and inexperience with the world at large. It is the direct result of their disability and the manner they are treated by their families, teachers, and other students. Individuals becoming disabled after they leave K-12 may also exhibit this dependent attitude, but usually not to the same degree and it is easier to overcome.

In order for transferring disabled students from K-12 to succeed in college it is necessary to break the "dependency barrier". This dependency barrier is exemplified by the students inability to take responsibility for their out-of-class studies, inability to be self starters, and to wait for someone else to do it for them.

In order to break this dependency barrier we have to develop those attitudinal skills necessary in order to succeed. The teaching of self-disipline, taking control of one's life, and goal setting must start at the K-12 level. By the time the student reaches the postsecondary level at age 18-21 it is almost impossible to break the dependency barrier.

RECOMMENDATION:

To develop guidance courses to teach the attitudinal skills necessary to succeed at the postsecondary level.

10. Is there a continuum of service provided for disabled students as they move through the public schools and into the postsecondary institutions. If this continuum does not exist, what actions should be taken to implement the needed services?

The quality of the continuum of services is dependent upon the relationship that exists between special education at the K-12 level and the Disabled Student Service Programs at local postsecondary institutions. It is necessary for the three segments to view each other as vital to the success of disabled students and to work cooperatively.

As a community college educator I am concerned how the Learning Disabilities Program at our campuses are viewed. I feel it is necessary for educators to recognize these programs as legitimate and providing continuing services to those LD Students who are transferring from the K-12 system.

RECOMMENDATION:

Establish local groups comprised of educators in special education for all three segments, to coordinate services and to expedite the transfer of disabled students to two and four year institutions.

## FINANCING SERVICES FOR DISABLED STUDENTS

2. What are the weaknesses of the present system?

The greatest weakness at this time is not knowing from year to year how much money will be available to work with. Currently it is a budget development system by the seat of the pants approach. In early spring we develop a budget to be submitted to our local districts. It has very little reliability because we have no idea what our allocations are going to be.

When we receive our final allocations in August or September we develop a new budget to submit to our local districts as well as to the state. This causes a lot of confusion in our local business offices. It also restricts our ability to plan and to develop new programs.

We cannot hire people for new positions usually until after the Fall term begins because the district will not allow us to commit until we can show the funds for the position. Some students do not receive the services they need during the first few weeks of the term because the final allocations have not arrived in time to hire the required personnel. This results in students having to drop out. This especially affects the early start semester campuses.

I begin each Fall term on faith that our allocation will be enough to provide the necessary services.

RECOMMENDATION:

At this time I just have a problem and not a solution. I realize that community colleges in general have the same problem.

Another weakness of the funding system for Disabled Student Services at Community Colleges is the allocations awards are determined by college data but the allocation is given to the district and they have the option to reallocate the funds to their individual campuses. This has created problems for small colleges that have large colleges in their districts.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the state allocation for Disabled Student Services at Community Colleges be made on a college basis and not a district basis.

I thank the planning committee for allowing this time for the Disabled Student Service Directors of Region 5 to present their views.

Prepared by:

Paul W. Lockman
Director
Disabled Student Services
Columbia College

Representing Region 5 Disabled Student Service Directors

Intro

There are three main points I wish to address today. They are all interrelated and together comprise the basis for the delivery of services to students with disabilities at CSUS.

First and foremost is our desperate need for permanent state funded positions. Our current funding system does not adequately provide for the positions necessary to deliver mandated services. Our program has, in the past, relied on federal funds, specifically the TRIO special Services Grant, which provides funding for 3 positions. Federal funding is now in decline. The TRIO grant has experienced budget cuts or level funding for the past five years. It has, therefore, become increasingly difficult to accommodate the needs of the growing number of disabled students. We now face additional budget cuts mandated by the Gramm-Rudman Act which will make it impossible to continue the level of services currently provided. Long term planning is out of the question in such an unstable and temporary funding environment.

Second, the postsecondary system is the only segment of state service which does not have an established classification for readers for blind and visually impaired employees. Permanent, state funded reader positions for blind, visually impaired as well as learning disabled employees at all levels is needed throughout the postsecondary school systems. This would be living up to the letter of the law in AB803 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 section 504 which requires reasonable accommodations be provided to qualified disabled employees.

Third, Services to Students with Disabilities has state of the art technological equipment which is currently underutilized due to the lack of personnel to provide training and assistance in the use of this equipment. We have developed an intricate computer network system that could greatly enhance our student's skills, and increase their potential in the job market. Again, permanent, state funded positions are required to meet this need.

In summary, it is impossible to assume that one director and one secretary can possibly deliver all of the mandated 14 core services. Full, permanent funding of positions is necessary to insure academic growth and retention of the growing disabled population at CSUS.

Our current funding system is based on a per capital base for 14 "core services." However, what we really need is recognized serialized positions to hire professional staff to provide and coordinate core services. Most of our allocation comes in Temporary Help and our contractual account. This creates an unstable and temporary environment. It is very hard to achieve long-term planning because of the temporary nature of the funding. Our current funding mechanism fails to recognize the complexity in coordinating core services and the administrative cost in providing these services.

Our program has been relying on federal funds, specifically the TRIO Special Services grant to support 3 positions that should have been funded on the state level. However, federal funding has been in decline. The Gramm-Rudman budget act has a devastating effect on the TRIO grant. We face a 4.3% cut in 86-87, and another 20% cut in 87-88. Without these positions, our ability to provide and coordinate core services will be seriously compromised.

It is obvious that the Gramm-Rudman act is forcing the state to assume more financial responsibility for the equal education opportunity of the disabled.

I urge the committe members to formulate a funding base that gives our program permanent,system-wide recognized positions.

To: Bruce D. Hamlett, Government and Public Affairs
From: Florie Luther, Graduate Student, CSU

I am a graduate student in Special Education at a California State University, and am quite concerned with the present situation concerning funding for disabled students in the California State University system.

As you know, the learning disabled students are in desparate need of funding. These students need to be properly assessed, counseled, advised, as well as tutored for more effective learning strategies So much can be done in order to better accommodate this population. The main goal of education is to make students marketable after completing coursework standards. With the aid of the properly provided services, the students will be given the opportunity to better achieve and succeed in their chosen fields of study. Their grade point averages will increase and their drop-out rate will decrease.

Other populations that may benefit from the ACR 3 proposal are the deaf and blind college students. Better quality services will become evident with improved programming. The deaf will need to be able to obtain interpreters with specialized vocabulary skills which will in turn justify an increase in interpreter salary and benefits.

The blind students may also be served with a better quality program through ACR 3. I do not believe that the voucher system for the blind is the answer to attention being brought up on the May 30th committee meeting in Fresno. The voucher system proved to be a costly misuse of available funds. In attempt to conserve remaining monies, I believe that a model can be developed in order to improve the existing situation.

The accusations from the blind students at the May 30th meeting were somewhat exaggerated and were an attempt to "cut down" services rendered. The services at California State Universities and other college systems are not a plot to diminish blind student independence, but to help them become better educated with the end result of becoming self-sufficient and vocationally independent citizens. If we can take the monies that would be used to implement voucher systems and put it in other useful areas such as equipment for the use of the blind, the students' needs can be met more fully and efficiently.

As a concerned student who is presently going into the Special Education field, I want to thank you for the opportunity to let me help. I only hope that my voice can be heard, and be beneficial towards the funding decision. I appreciate being able to attend the meeting on May 30th and to take an active role in assisting the disabled college students.

Sincerely,

Florie Luther
Graduate Student, CSU

I'd like to address issues needing resolution if our deaf students are to benefit from educational support services.

In regard to policy, there is a critical need to recognize that for deaf students, American Sign Language or ASL is the native or first language.

1. Recognizing ASL as the first language and English as second would help to bridge the cultural gap deaf students face and struggle with on our mainstreamed campuses.

2. Recognizing that English is a second language would mean that deaf students would take up English as a Second Language or ESL classes. Cultural differences between spoken written language nad signed language would be taken under consideration. Problems that now confront deaf students such as English based tests like the Writing Proficiency Exam could be handled in a positive manner. The ACT and SAT tests currently used as a critia for admission could be evaluated on the basis of bilingual and bicultural differences.

3. New admission standards requiring two years of a foreign language will add another, almost insurmountable barrier for deaf students and will prevent many other wise qualified deaf students from enrolling. A policy stating that ASL is the first language for many deaf students would alleviate this barrier and permit deaf students to concentrate on Englishas a second or foreign language.

4. Recognizing that deaf students are bilingual and thus bi-cultural would truly give deaf students equal access to our mainstreamed campuses.

Another need concerning educational support services for equal access for deaf students is the establishment of a classification for hiring staff interpreters. Currently, we can only hire on-call or freelance interpreters by the hour. These interpreters are not offered guaranteed hours or benefits. Interpreters are increasingly reluctant to accept work by the hour without benefits or any assurance of steady work. In order for us to be able to hire qualified, experienced educational interpreters, we must be able to offerfull or parttime staff positions with guaranteed hours and benefits. We all know there is a national shortage of available interpreters. The establishment of a classification for staff interpreter positions offering benefit and more permanency would allow us to recruit the experienced, qualified interpreters needed to provide this critical educational support required for equal access for our deaf students.

The establishment of a classification for staff interpreter positions means a permanent mechanism for funding these positions is needed. Interpreting services are the most critical core service for deaf students and is also the most expensive. We must be assured funding based on actual cost of providing this service.

In summary, there are two basic issues related to providing equal access for deaf students:

1. Recognizing them as being bilingual and bicultural
2. Establishing a classification for staff interpreters and a permanent, actual cost funding for these positions.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS:

American Sign Language (ASL): the visual-gestural language used by Deaf Americans. This language meets linguistic criteria as a separate, distinct language with its own syntact and smeantics. (Baker-Cokely, 1983)

Deaf Culture:describes the values, social rules and mores of Deaf Americans.

Mainstreamed: refers to deaf students attending regular college classes with support services such as sign language interpreters and notetakers.

ESL: English as a second language. Specifically using proscribed teaching and learning techniques for learning a second language using the students' first language as a base.

Equal access: The right to equal participation in all programs funded by Federal monies. Includes removal of archiectual barriers, braille signs, course modification, sign language interpreters, etc.

SAT, ACT: Scholastic Achievement Test and American College Test: used as criteria for admission.

RID, Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf: a national interpreter organization that evaluates and certifies interpreters.

Code of Ethics; RIDs guidelines for professional conduct.

**State of California**

# Memorandum

Matsui
California State University
Dominguez Hills

**To** : Bruce Hamlett
California Post-Secondary Education
Commission

**Date:** June 3, 1986

**From** : Mark Matsui
Coordinator, Disabled Student Services

**Subject:** *ACR 3 Testimony, Public Hearings*
*El Camino College - May 23, 1986*

I'd like to address some of the questions about "Financing Services for Disabled Student Services." The questions my testimony will address are numbers one, two, five, and six as stated in the agenda materials.

Question one asks: What are the strengths of the present system of financing disabled student services?

The present system affords us a great deal of flexibility in terms of how we as program manager's can utilize our personnel budgets. Our funds are distributed in permanent positions and in temporary help positions. The temporary help funds can be used in different ways. First and foremost, they can be used for direct services, i.e., readers, notetakers, etc. Secondly, temporary help funds can be used to hire "temporary" administrative support positions, i.e., disability management advisors, support services coordinator, L.D. specialist, Deaf and Hearing Impaired Specialist, etc.

Question two: What are the weaknesses of the present system?

The present system does not address the changing professional staffing needs in the CSU. We are currently only funded for a full-time, permanent Director and a full-time, permanent department secretary. Any other professional staff must be hired through temporary help funds which seriously encroaches on the funds intended and needed for direct services. I must add that it's impossible to successfully provide all of the services needed without additional professional staff.

The additional staffing needs we're currently experiencing in the CSU, include positions for:

Assistant Directors
Disability Management Adviser's
Support Services Coordinator
Learning Disabilities Specialist
Visually Impaired Specialist
Deaf/Hearing Impaired Specialist

In addition, the current system does not address the difficulties incurred by an unexpected increase in the numbers of students in a given disability group. The cost of services for these students can affect the overall budget dramatically. A factor contributing to the difficulties created by this type of enrollment increase, are the regional differences in the cost of the same services. The costs for sign language interpreters in the San Francisco Bay area is considerably higher than it is in Los Angeles.

The current funding approach also affects large and small campuses differently. Larger campuses can better absorb the costs of small increases in enrollment, however the smaller campuses lack economies of scale. On my campus (Dominguez Hills), an increase of a single deaf student can severely impact our budget because of the expenses incurred by the provision of interpreter and notetaker services.

Question 5: What principles should the State (as distinct from the systems or campuses) follow in funding services for students with disabilities? (for example, the principle of funding "core services" with segment-specific services provided in addition, or a common set of criteria rather than "core services"? Equivalent standards for cost and service comparisons? Flexibility? etc.

Question 6: What services are necessary for the successful accommodation of disabled students in order for them to complete their education at a postsecondary institution in California?

The CSU is interested in the funding of additional positions that will give us the opportunity to provide adequate services for students with disabilities. The Planning Committee has a funding proposal which attempts to address the difficulties encountered in the CSU. I support that proposal, and the notion of "Core Services." We have never been adequately funded for "Core Services," and the proposal I support attempts to address that problem.

I don't feel that the same set of "Core Services" can and should be funded across all three segments. Some segment specific services must be funded because of the differences in the student populations we serve. In addition, equivalent standards for cost of services cannot be used because of regional differences in the costs of particular services.

Finally, I feel that the 14 "Core Services" the CSU is currently providing are necessary for the successful accommodation of disabled students in the CSU. The addition of professional staff and additional funding for direct services to address the issue of the increasing numbers of students having a Learning Disability must be recognized on a systemwide basis. Our campus does not have a Learning Disabilities Specialist and consequently, the ability to do diagnostic assessment. We can only serve those students who come to us with documentation of their disability already in-hand. The experience and knowledge I've gained by working with L.D. students has made it clear to me that approximately six students per year come to me seeking services for what clearly appears to be a bonafide Learning Disability. Since we don't have the ability to do diagnostic assessment, they're given community referrals including the Department of Rehabilitation. Very few of these students follow through or return to our office. Our current set of "Core Services" doesn't address the need for the ability to do diagnosis or does it adequately meet their need for support services. These students aren't receiving an equitable educational experience, and I believe the CSU and the State of California needs to add these services to our present list of "Core Services."

MM:mjt

cc:Suzanne Gemmell
Carmen Buford
file

# TESTIMONY TO THE ACR 3 PLANNING COMMITTEE, IN FRESNO

Mr. Chairman and members of the ACR 3 Committee:

My name is Maria Morais, 1755 E. Roberts, #104, Fresno, California 93710. I am a student at Fresno State. As a blind student I would like to suggest some ways in which services for the blind in college can be immensely improved.

To begin with, it is very important that students, handicapped or not, have control over their academic lives. A large part of academic independence for me, as well as other blind students, revolves around reader services. We need access to our own readers, which we can hire or fire according to our work load. This policy would give us the responsibility for providing much of our own services, and would go a long way towards giving blind students the type of independence which is so necessary for true success in college. College students study at all hours of the day and night, and accordingly, we need the versatility which personal control over our own reader funds would yield. For every blind student who needs something read at 2:00 a.m., there are several sighted students who would be pleased to earn minimum wage and accord such services. Personally controlled and solicited readers are both feasible and desirable.

There is no need for the existence of a middle man, such as Disabled Student Services, in this process. On the whole, they only seem to get in the way and minimize the efficiency of reader services. This inefficiency arises in terms of actual services rendered, as well as the cost of such services. When a blind student is forced to go through Disabled Student Services he must rely on their skill and goodwill, either one of which might be lacking. Why must blind students be forced to deal with a bureaucracy, simply to gain the few services which we really need? From a financial standpoint, student control over reader funds is vastly preferable as well. If we are allotted funds to hire readers according to some equitable formula, say one and one-half reader hours per week, per unit, there would be a clearly defined limit on expenditures. Interestingly enough, the fear of "gauging the system" has been put to me by a disabled student coordinator, who is making over $30,000.00 a year. This amount would fund almost 10,000 reader hours in a given year. Salaries and other administrational costs now being used to fund Disabled Student Services are costing far more than student control reader funds ever could.

To illustrate the points which I am trying to make, I would like to use the Fresno State Disabled Student Services as an example. They are open from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and blind students are expected to get all of their reading and research done during those times. We are at the mercy of staff employees and must depend on them for the services which we so vitally need. In addition, I know of at least three employees who are paid over $6.00 an hour, predominantly for reading. Under the system which I am proposing, I would have access to readers around the clock, seven days a week. These readers would be paid $3.35 per hour, and I would control my own reader services, which are an indispensible element in my education.

After control of reader services, what blind students really need is freedom. There is virtually nothing that we cannot do, either on our own or with the cooperation of a reader. We are perfectly competent to handle our own academic needs, ranging from test taking to research, if only we have the necessary resources. I would like to point out that in the many years prior to the inception of Disabled Student Services, numerous blind individuals successfully attended and graduated from college under the voucher system.

It is important to realize that too many services performed for the blind can be a very bad thing. When someone is doing everything for an individual, it is easy for that individual to become lazy, as he loses all incentive to develop his abilities through challenge and work. It makes me very upset to see that it is now becoming possible for blind students to coast through college without fulfilling their responsibilities, completing basic academic requirements or doing such simple things as interacting with a professor. It is often, in my opinion, Disabled Student Services who are causing this disintegration to happen. In the long run it diminishes my degree and the legitimate academic accomplishments of all other blind students as well. Please, for the sake of all blind students, realize that a good Disabled Student Service program is one that wholeheartedly strives for obsolescence. Personal inability resulting from dependence is far worse than any physical handicap.

In my mind the function of a Disabled Student Service should be to place handicapped students on an equal footing with their counterparts. For the blind this can be accomplished primarily through funding personally controlled reader services, and perhaps, when appropriate, providing a place where students can gain access to resource information and basic adaptive equipment. Once we are placed in a position of equality, however, what we do with this equality must be left up to us. Potential failure is certainly the down side of equality, but if I am never given the right to fail, I am never given the right to truly succeed.

A final overall point which I would like to bring up is the need for a certain fundamental attitude change. The Disabled Student Services must get used to listening to students. We have the largest stake in the services provided and, therefore, we should have a voice in these services. Liberty and services should not have to be mutually exclusive. During the last two months I have ceased going through the DSS office at Fresno State for everything except testing. This was a decision which I felt I had to make for both academic efficiency and for my own peace of mind. Since this step, I have felt much better about my overall college experience. The point to be made here is that we should not have to give up our liberty to utilize services, nor should we have to give up services in order to gain liberty. If only Disabled Student Services would truly begin listening, this horrible false dichotomy might be eliminated.

Along these lines, Mr. Chairman, I would like to register a complaint. It was not generally made known to students, by the DSS at Fresno State, that this hearing was going to take place. I heard about it through a different source, without which I would never have known of this hearing today. After becoming aware of your committee, I went into the main DSS office at Fresno State seeking more information. I was told that no one who could answer my questions was available and that I should call later. When I called back, I was again put off and asked to leave a message. Mr. Chairman, that phone call was never returned. I hope, and I am reasonably certain, that this restricted testimony approach does not reflect the attitude or the intent of this committee or the legislature.

In conclusion, services for the blind can be made cheaper, more efficient, and generally better by giving us the few services we need, and then the freedom to use them.

# TESTIMONY CONCERNING ACR 3 - EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISABLED STUDENTS

May 29, 1986

Presented by Betsy Nordmeyer
Vocational Specialist
Santa Clara Unified School District

Concerning the plan for more effective educational services to students with disabilities, I would like to address the element of ways of improving the academic preparation of disabled students in secondary schools. I would like to describe a program which offers shared responsibility and cooperative, coordinated efforts by educational institutions, and comprehensive institutional efforts to meet the educational needs of disabled students.

Project Work-Ability, begun in 1982 at selected school districts and county offices of education in California, now includes one hundred and thirty sites throughout the state. Work-Ability is a cooperative, coordinated effort to provide cost-effective services to disabled youth, through linkages among schools, the Department of Rehabilitation, community-based organizations, the Employment Development Department, and now, with the second phase called Work-Ability II, community colleges and regional occupational programs, working in a coordinated effort with clients of the Department of Rehabilitation.

In Question 3 of the pamphlet on "Ways of Improving the Academic Preparation of Disabled Students in Secondary Schools," there is a statement in the last paragraph which refers to development of entry level employment skills as opposed to postsecondary educational opportunities. I submit that these goals need not be in opposition. I would like to describe a case study from this year's Project Work-Ability program in the Santa Clara Unified School District.

John (not his real name) was a student with severe language difficulties in reading and writing. Verbal communication oral skills were above average. In his sophomore year, John received a vocational assessment, including interest tests and work samples. He demonstrated a high interest in and aptitude for mechanics. John was enrolled in the Central County Occupational Center the following year. This is a mainstreamed vocational training program. He studied engine repair, parts and machining. He received regular tutoring and support services to help him succeed in the program. Frequent meetings were held with his vocational teacher to monitor his progress. The next year (this year), his senior year, he enrolled in tune-up. With regular tutoring in vocabulary, math, and reading the shop manuals, he completed the course. This spring, John met with a counselor from the Department of Rehabilitation who came to the school site to discuss opportunities for further training. John had already heard about a technical training program in Arizona from a speaker at the Central County Occupational Center. At the school site meeting, John and his father were given information about community college opportunities. The Department of Rehabilitation could provide assistance with tools and equipment for training as well as with placement once training was completed. California community colleges now have learning centers to support disabled students in their studies, and this information was also given to John and his father. Application procedures were discussed. The school district conducted a field trip to a nearby community college so that students could meet with counselors, ask questions, and see for themselves what services were available.

John decided to enroll in a program for further training in Arizona. He was able to make an informed decision because he knew his own interests and abilities, he knew what postsecondary opportunities were available, and he knew what services would be available at the completion of this training.

John's experience represents the effectiveness of a coordinated, comprehensive program like Project Work-Ability. Another focus of Work-Ability is to support on-the-job training for disabled students in the areas of their vocational interest. Funding sources for John's training came from the school district Master Plan state monies, Vocational Education Act funds, Project Work-Ability funds, and Department of Rehabilitation funds.

Because John's career interests and abilities were identified early, he was able to plan his secondary courses to meet his career goals. In the same way, other students in the Santa Clara Unified School District plan their programs which include postsecondary education. Far from being in opposition to postsecondary education and training, the pursuit of career goals in an organized manner encourages attendance at community colleges among our disabled students.

John's case is not unique. The linkages established by coordinated, comprehensive programs, such as Project Work-Ability provide a mechanism and a continuum of services for bridging high school students into the community colleges. Access to school electives is encouraged and supported. In many districts, graduation credits in areas such as math and science are being granted for material covered in vocational courses. In my own experience with disabled high school youth, I have witnessed many occasions in which the academic preparation was meaningless and discouraging to the students until they saw the need for the academic skills in their vocational courses.

I therefore recommend that the committee charged with providing more effective educational services to our disabled students give serious consideration to cooperative, coordinated, and successful programs like Project Work-Ability, which are already in place and have demonstrated success. It may be that career education in a broad sense is the most effective framework on which to build better postsecondary opportunities for disabled students, to raise their aspirations and assist them in achieving their lifetime goals.

LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL ON DISABILITY
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 485-6334 • 485-4103 • TDD 485-6655

Mr. Bruce Hamlett
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento. California 95814

June 12. 1986

Dear Mr. Hamlett.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on ACR3.

My testimony came from my intimate knowledge of the problems that have occurred with the disabled at UCLA and from my training in social/cultural anthropology.

University administrators, faculty and staff, like the rest of the general population, have no idea on how to treat disabled individuals. It is out of this ignorance, that we have seen problems at UCLA. Federal and State laws have been flagrantly violated. Some individuals with physical limitations were forced to leave UCLA due to the lack of access and sensitivity while others have remained in spite of degrading and embarrassing experiences. I am enclosing some of our complaints against UCLA, to give you an idea of the problems.

In American anthropology, when we work with various people whether it is a specific social group or a certain culture as a whole, we have to comply with some basic requirements. We are obligated to learn the language of "our group", to actually live among them for a length of time and to experience their culture ourselves. Only then. could we begin to understand them and be deemed qualified to work among them.

In Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology, we have come to see the disabled and their experiences as a "sub-culture" apart from that of the general population. That is why we speak of "mainstreaming" the disabled. However, in the hiring of administrators to run the offices of disabled students programs, no criteria as mentioned above has been formulated.

I submit, that some criteria should be set to assure greater understanding. At present, people are being hired because they have an M.A. in administration or social work without any special training in disability issues. Just as anthropologists are required to "learn the language" and "experience their group", so should those who work with the disabled, if we wish to succeed in our efforts.

Sincerely,

Nadia D. Powers

Nadia D. Powers

President - Richard Smith Vice President - Jane Small
Secretary - Annette Starr Hudson

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

# A SURVEY OF CORE SERVICES PROVIDED THROUGH THE DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES OFFICES

SUBMITTED: MAY 15, 1985
PAUL M. PRESTON
CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY HAYWARD

## OVERALL SURVEY OF C.S.U. CORE SERVICES

Introduction.
This survey was intended to examine existing core services and potential core services. It does not evaluate the established categories of disabilities or the criteria which are needed to be verified as a disabled student. The questionnaire itself was divided into three parts: Existing Core Services; Potential Core Services; and Overall Comments on Core Services. It was sent to all 19 Coordinators of the Disabled Student Services program at each of the California State University campuses; eighteen campuses responded to the survey. One main goal of this compilation is to obtain from the campuses an overall sense regarding core services. This report could serve as a working document which could then facilitate the future directions which the State University system takes with regard to core services.

In order to streamline this compilation, responses were grouped together whenever possible. It was the intent of the author to present an objective yet concise systemwide survey on core services. The author apologizes to any coordinator whose responses were not fully represented in this survey in an effort to consolidate the considerable information presented.

My thanks to Harriet Clendenen of Cal-Poly San Luis Obispo who assisted in the preparation of the survey.

The results of this survey can be divided into five areas:

I. An evaluation of those core services presently identified as being offered. (p.2-4)

II An evaluation of non-designated services which have been suggested as being offered. (p.5-8)

III. An evaluation of how well specific populations are served by core services. (p.9-10)

IV. An evaluation of how DSS Coordinators feel about their role in providing core services. (p.11-12)

V. An evaluation of how well other campus offices are providing their services to students with disabilities. (p.13-14)

## I. EXISTING CORE SERVICES

Narrative:
The Chancellor's Office has identified 14 core services to be provided to students wi verified disabilities. (See Attachment A.) The questionnaire surveyed the campuses wi regard to these 14 core services. DSS Coordinators were asked to choose one of four respons for each core service: the service should be continued as is; the service needs expansion clarification; the service is not needed; other responses.

Results:
The results on "Existing Core Services" are shown in Table I. Almost all responses fell in either of the first two responses: continue the service as is, or the service nee clarification/ expansion. With only two exceptions, no campus coordinator felt that any the 14 core services was not needed, although some of the smaller campuses reported providi certain core services only occasionally.

These results can be grouped as follows:
- -service(s) which at least half of the respondents felt needed clarification
- -service(s) which at least one-third of the respondents felt needed clarification
- -service(s) which most respondents felt should be left as-is.

TABLE I

| Core Service | Continue As Is | Clarify/Expand | Not Needed |
|---|---|---|---|
| Interpreters | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| Readers | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| Notetakers | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| Facilitation of Access | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| Adaptive Equipment | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| Mobility Assistance | 15 | 3 | 0 |
| Test-Taking | 15 | 3 | 0 |
| Special Educational Materials | 15 | 2 | 1 |
| Priority Enrollment | 15 | 2 | 1 |
| Parking | 16 | 2 | 0 |
| On-off campus referral | 17 | 1 | 0 |
| Special Orientation | 17 | 1 | 0 |
| Registration | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Lists of service providers | 18 | 0 | 0 |

Discussion.
1 A. The one existing core service which generated the most divided response w "Interpreters". Nine campuses felt this service should be continued as is: nine oth campuses felt the service needed expansion/clarification. The most frequent complaint campuses) regarding interpreters was establishing an appropriate pay rate. Other concerns we the parameters of interpreter services: does it include staff needs? does it include extende education students? Several campuses (5) voiced concerns about interpreter coordinat Regarding this last concern, on a separate survey question regarding the potential service o "service coordination", 6 campuses reported they were already providing this service. Most o these campuses felt that service coordination was part of the core services of readers. interpreters and notetakers. (See pages 5 & 6 )

Discussion.
1 B. Four existing core services received mixed comments. They were: Readers, Notetakers, Facilitation of Access, and Adaptive Equipment. Each received 12 responses to leave this service as is, and 6 responses which requested further clarification or expansion.

Readers: concerns regarding the extent of reader services to Learning Disabled Students (3), revising the existing funding formula for reader services (3), should reader services cover internships and graduate projects, and a need for a permanent staff coordinator position for campuses with large reader needs. Also, in a separate question regarding whether or not the campus suggests a certain number of hours for reader services, there was a split opinion. Eight campuses did not: nine campuses did, usually suggesting 1.5 reader hours per hour of class. One campus did not respond to this question.

Notetakers: concerns regarding the increase in notetaker services to L.D. students; when to use volunteer notetakers (5).

Facilitation of Access to All Programs: a concern with including Admissions as a service: a recognition of the increased workload regarding L.D. students: a need to be compensated for Extension students; a concern over Architectural Barriers.

Adaptive equipment: a concern about storage space for equipment: a need for more funding to cover increased equipment costs: a question of how individualized should equipment be.

Discussion.
1 C. The 9 remaining core services generally received satisfactory comments from at least 15 of the campuses. There were, however, some concerns which were raised. Although these concerns were few, several appear to be serious for that particular campus with the concern.

Mobility assistance: 15 campuses felt this should be left as is; 1 campus said the service was usually provided by the Department of Rehabilitation: 2 campuses wanted to know the extent this service should be provided.

Specialized educational materials. 15 campuses felt this should be left as is: 2 campuses felt unclear what was meant by this service. One campus felt the campus Library should handle this service.

I. EXISTING CORE SERVICES (continued)

10. Discussion.

Test-taking: 15 campuses felt this should be left as is; 1 campus reported a need to identify a more formalized testing system that would be equitable; 1 campus felt more funds were needed for test proctors.

Priority enrollment: 15 campuses felt this should be left as is; 2 campuses reported that disabled students were not allowed priority enrollment (nor were any other groups.) One campus felt that another office (Admissions & Records) should handle this service.

Parking: 16 campuses felt this should be left as is; 1 campus indicated that only those students with DMV blue placards are given handicapped parking on campus.

On-off campus referrals: 17 campuses felt this should be left as is.

Orientation: 17 campuses felt this should be left as is; one felt more campus involvement was needed.

Registration: All campuses felt this should be left as is.

List of service providers: All campuses felt this should be left as is.

Recommendation.

1. Funding increases for Interpreters.
2. A systemwide Coordinators meeting to discuss existing core services, particularly: Interpreters, Readers, Notetakers, Adaptive Equipment and Facilitation of Access to All Programs.
3. A review of services to Learning Disabled Students, including type of services, range of services, and impact on other DSS services.
4. An updated version of the Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities (1980).

## II. POTENTIAL CORE SERVICES

Narrative.
Potential services were those services not apparently included or designated as a core service. Although some DSS programs are able to supplement their core services with special grants, Coordinators were asked to confine their responses to DSS funded services only. The list of potential services was suggested at previous meetings of DSS Coordinators. The overall survey method was to ask the Coordinator to evaluate each potential core service and respond in one of 6 ways: the Coordinator felt this service was already included in the parameters of the 14 core services (and if so which one); this service should not be included as a core service; this service should be provided by another unit of the University: this service should be included as a core service (if so, could this be done under present funding allocations, or would additional allocations be necessary); or other comments. (One reason for this rather complex set of responses was to incorporate various campus interpretations of the existing core services. As a later survey question pointed out, the majority of campus Coordinators feel that the core services are guidelines rather than absolutes.)

Results.
Seventeen (17) potential core services were listed (See Attachement B). Coordinators were also encouraged to add other potential services. Since there were so few additional services suggested, they will not be discussed here but listed in Attachment B.

These results can basically be grouped into services that should be provided (or are already being provided) and those services that should not be provided. There were twelve (12) of the listed potential services that a clear majority of the campuses felt should be or already were included as a core service. Four (4) of the potential core services were identified by a clear majority as not to be considered a core service. One potential core service received a split vote, half feeling it should be a core service, and half feeling it should not be a core service.

Discussion.
II A. Table IIA displays those twelve potential services which received strong endorsement from the Coordinators surveyed. The table is arranged to show how many of the 18 respondents answered affirmatively and, of that number, which were already providing this service, which would provide this service if it was designated as a core service, which could only provide this service if additional monies were allocated, and which felt another unit of the University should be providing this service.

(continued)

TABLE II-A

| Item | Total affirmative | Already providing | Enough $$ to provide | More $$ to provide | Elsewhe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outreach | 18 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 5 |
| Test proctors | 17 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Services coordination | 17 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Admissions assistance | 17 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| Faculty consultation | 17 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Lab/Computer Assistants | 16 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| Counseling | 16 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| Tutoring | 16 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| L.D. Assessment | 16 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 |
| Mobility Guides | 15 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| Library Research | 15 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| Equipment Repair | 14 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 0 |

The results of this part of the survey fall into three general categories:

1. A potential service that should be included/designated as a core service and could be done without (substantial) funding changes.
   - -Test-proctors
   - -Faculty consultation
   - -Admissions assistance

2. A potential service that should be designated as a core service but could not be provided without additional funding.
   - -Outreach
   - -L.D. Assessment
   - -Tutoring
   - -Lab/Computer Assistance

3. **A potential service that should be designated as a core service but which** received no clear consensus of opinion regarding whether it did or did not need additional funding in order to provide this service.
   - -Services coordination
   - -Counseling
   - -Mobility Guides
   - -Library Research
   - -Equipment Repair

Discussion.

1. Services that would not require any (substantial) change in funding. This group of potential services are either already being provided under present funding, or it has bee indicated that they could be provided without additional funds if so designated. There were three services which fell into this category:

Test proctors. Thirteen of the campuses were already providing this service: most campuses that were felt that this was a part of Core service #14 - Test-taking assistance (6); 1 campus felt it could provide test-proctors without additional funding if it was so designated.

Faculty Consultation. Nine campuses were already providing this service, most referring to Core Service #4 - Facilitation of access to all programs. Seven other campuses felt they could provide this service without additional funds.

Admissions assistance. Five campuses were already providing this service, most referring to Core Service #8 - Facilitation of access to all programs. Eight campuses felt they could provide this service within the existing funding if so designated.

2. Services that would require additional funding in order to provide this service.

Outreach. This was the one service that all respondents (18 campuses) felt needed to be provided to students with disabilities. Twelve of the campuses felt that additional funds would be necessary in order for the DSS office to be providing outreach. Five campuses felt that this service should be provided by other campus units (such as the Office for School Relations).

Learning disability assessment. No campus was providing this as a DSS core service. Fourteen of the campuses felt that additional funds would be needed in order to provide some sort of l.d. assessment/diagnosis. Two campuses felt this service should be provided by other campus offices (Testing or Counseling).

Lab/computer assistance. Four campuses are currently offering this service (as a part of core service #1/2/3 or #9). Most campuses (10) felt additional funds would be needed in order to provide this service.

Tutoring. Only two campuses were currently providing this service. Fourteen campuses felt that tutoring should be a core service but would need additional funding in order to provide it on their campus.

On separate questions, these latter two services - l.d. assessment and outreach - were the two services which the majority of campuses prioritized as needing to be designated and funded as core services.

3. Services that should be designated as core services but without clear consensus of whether or not additional funding is necessary to provide this. The remainder of the services in Table 1 received fairly evenly split responses in this regard.

TABLE II-B.

Table II represents those services which a majority of campuses felt should not be considered as a core service, or should not be provided by the DSS Office.

| Item | Total negative | Elsewhere | Already providing | More $ to pro |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Off-campus transportation | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Personal Care Attendants | 14 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Physical Therapy | 10 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| Advising | 3 | 10 | 2 | 3 |

The first three services - off-campus transportation, personal attendants, and physical therapy - were all clearly rejected by a majority of the Coordinators as services to be provided by the DSS Office. The fourth service - advising - was felt to be more appropriately provided by another campus office: most Coordinators suggested Academic departments should provide advising to students.

C. There was one potential service which received an evenly split opinion on whether or not it should be designated as a core service - "Typists". Since there was no detailed explanation of this service, it is not clear how each campus was interpreting this service.

Recommendation.

1. There seems to be general agreement that test proctors are part of a Core Service (Special Test-taking arrangements) and should be so included.

2. The services of Faculty consultation and Admissions assistance could be considered a part of the Core Service - Facilitation of access to all programs. Since neither of these two services would apparently involve additional funding, strong consideration should be given to including them as part of this core service.

3. Coordinators feel strongly that four services - outreach, l.d. assessment, tutoring, and lab/computer assistance - should be offered to students with disabilities. Since these services could not be provided without additional funds, steps should be undertaken to consider implementing such services.

4. One service - advising - was felt to be an important service to students with disabilities. However, the majority of coordinators felt this should normally be undertaken outside the DSS office; most campuses suggested advising be done by the academic departments.

5. Further studies are needed on the remaining services - services coordination, counseling, mobility guides, library research and equipment repair. This would require more in-depth study on the need, feasibility, and costs for providing such service(s).

6. The question of Typing as a core service needs further study.

## III. SPECIFIC POPULATIONS SERVED

Narrative.
This part of the survey reflects questions which asked Coordinators to evaluate how well four categories of disabled students were served by DSS. The four categories - mobility impaired, visually impaired, hearing impaired, and learning disabled - reflect categories of disabilities set up by the Chancellor's Office for reporting purposes.

Coordinators were asked to choose one of four responses for each population: DSS services are adequate as is; additional services are needed; provision of services is difficult because of inadequate funding; provision of services is difficult because of a lack of qualified service providers.

Results.
Table III illustrates the range of responses to the question of how well four categories of disabled students were served by DSS Services. Eighteen campuses responded. Campuses could check more than one response if applicable.

TABLE III

| Disability Category | Adequate as is | Need Additional Services | Inadequate Funds | Insufficient quality Service providers |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mobility-Imp. | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Visually-Imp. | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Hearing-Imp. | 2 | 5 | 10 | 4 |
| Learning Dis. | 0 | 9 | 14 | 9 |

In a separate question regarding whether or not DSS provided services to emotionally disabled students, sixteen (16) campuses reported that they did; two (2) campuses did not. Most of those campuses which did cited providing registration assistance, referral and special orientation for students with emotional disabilities.

Discussion.
The results of this part of the survey corroborate with previous sections of the survey: that the hearing impaired and the learning disabled (particularly the latter) are not sufficiently provided for under present core services. Learning disabled appear to be the least served population within the state system: a majority of coordinators feel that additional funds and services are needed to address this deficiency.

III. SPECIFIC POPULATIONS SERVED (continued)

Recommendation.

1. Services to learning disabled students needs immediate attention, including additional funds. An overall study should be made of the range and type of services to be offered.

2. Services to hearing impaired students needs additional funds in order to begin addressing adequate provision of services.

3. Services to the visually impaired need further study in order to provide better services to this population. This examination should include several concerns which arose from this survey: the present funding formula, the use of volunteer notetakers, a limit on the number of reader hours, and the overall extent of reader services.

4. The majority of campuses (16) reported serving students with emotional disabilities. Further studies should be undertaken to examine the extent of services needed by this population.

## IV. ATTITUDE OF DSS COORDINATORS REGARDING PROVISION OF (CORE) SERVICES

Narrative. Several questions were posed to DSS Coordinators regarding how they perceive their ability to provide services. The questions covered the following areas:

1. Interpretation of the services:
   - -Are present core services satisfactorily clear to the Coordinator?
   - -Does the Coordinator restrict DSS services only to core services?
   - -Should all campuses be providing essentially the same services?
   - -Should services to students be limited under any circumstances?

2. Funding of core services:
   - -Is the present funding formula satisfactory?
   - -Are present funds sufficient to cover the existing core services?

Results.
1. Twelve (12) campuses felt the overall core services were sufficiently clear to them as presently outlined; six (6) campuses wanted further clarification or explanation.

Fifteen (15) campuses used the core services as guidelines; three (3) campuses restricted services to only those core services.

Eleven (11) campuses felt that each campus should determine the range and amount of services; seven (7) campuses felt that services should be essentially equivalent throughout the state.

Eleven (11) Coordinators felt they would never refuse or limit services even if the classes were inappropriate for the student; seven (7) Coordinators said they would consider limiting services.

2. Thirteen (13) campuses preferred using a direct cost basis for funding some services such as notetakers, readers; five (5) campuses were content with the present funding formula.

Twelve (12) campuses maintained that they were unable to provide the 14 core services under present funding conditions; three (3) campuses maintained that they could provide only the 14 core services under present funding conditions; three (3) campuses maintained that they were occasionally able to provide more than the 14 core services under present funding conditions.

Discussion.
The majority (15) of Coordinators use the designated core services as guidelines for providing services to students with disabilities. Most (12) feel reasonably clear about their understanding of the core services. There are, however, several coordinators (6) who feel further clarification is needed. Regarding the question of equivalent services throughout the state and the question of limiting services under certain conditions, there appears to be substantial enough disagreement that an effort should be made to address these differences.

Regarding funding, it would appear that other funding formulas need to be considered, as well as examining funding levels.

## IV. ATTITUDE OF OSS COORDINATORS (continued)

Recommendation.

1. More frequent regional or state-wide meetings would help clarify some of the issues brought up in the previous discussion. This could also include a revision of the current Policy manual which has not been updated since 1980.

2. A study of the present funding formula needs immediate attention. Several responses throughout this survey point to dissatisfaction with the present funding formula including a majority (12) of coordinators who feel they are unable to adequately provide even the present core services.

## V. OTHER CAMPUS OFFICES PROVISION OF SERVICES TO DISABLED STUDENTS

Narrative.
DSS coordinators were surveyed to see how well they felt other campus offices were providing services to students with disabilities.

Results.
Table IV below shows the results of responses to how well other campus offices are providing services to students with disabilities. Total points were calculated by assigning 4 points for each excellent rating, 3 points for good, 2 points for fair, and 1 point for poor.

TABLE IV

| OFFICE | EXCELLENT | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | TOTAL PTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Health Services | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 62 |
| Financial Aid | 9 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 60 |
| Testing | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 59 |
| Career Planning/Placement | 8 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 57 |
| Admissions & Records | 5 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 55 |
| Housing | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 53 |
| Counseling | 5 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 53 |
| Police/Public Safety | 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 52 |
| Library | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 51 |
| Bookstore | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 50 |
| Student Activities | 2 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 45 |
| Extension/Continuing Ed | 0 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 40 |
| Learning/ Tutorial Center | 3 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 40 |

Discussion.
It would appear that most campus offices are providing good to excellent services for students with disabilities. The two notable exceptions are the Learning/ Tutorial Center and Extended Education. This is important in two respects. The Learning Centers are presumably providing tutorial services to all students; as noted earlier, the majority of DSS offices are not providing tutoring. This would lend further imperative to strongly consider examining tutoring as a core service, or insure that if other campus offices are providing this service, it is adequate. The other office - Extended Education - is noteworthy since at this point DSS Offices are providing extended education students full services without actual funding.

V. OTHER CAMPUS SERVICES (continued)

Another campus office - Student Activities - also received lower ratings. This might be of concern if students with disabilities were not receiving full access to campus activities.

Recommendation.

1. Services to the learning disabled, particularly tutoring, need attention since that campus Learning Centers generally do not appear to be providing adequate services to students with disabilities: other disability groups may also be affected by this.

2. Improved relations are needed between the DSS offices and the offices of Extended Education, particularly in light of the fact that extension students are provided the full range of services as regularly matriculated students.

CONCLUSION:

The following points should be considered as a result of this survey:

1. There could be much more consistent and improved services through better communication between Coordinators, particularly through systemwide meetings which would address some of the clarification needed.

2. Additional funds are needed to provide designated core services on at least some campuses.

3. Threaded throughout the responses to this survey were concerns about the range type and funds for services to learning disabled. This population is apparently severely underserved and DSS programs are severely underfunded to provide services.

4. Increased funding and salaries would partially alleviate concerns with provision of services to hearing impaired students.

5. An overall outreach program is needed to address the underrepresented population of students with disabilities.

6. The original Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities was written in 1980. There should be on-going review and updating of this manual if it is to serve as a working document.

Attachment A

From: The Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities (1980)

## SUPPORT SERVICES

The Disabled Student Services Program on each campus encourages personal independence and integration of the student into the total campus community. Campus support services for students with disabilities include the 14 core services identified in the "Report of the Systemwide Task Force on Services to Students with Disabilities" published by CPEC in 1979. These services are:

1. Interpreter services
2. Reader services
3. Notetaker services
4. Mobility assistance
5. Registration assistance
6. Priority enrollment
7. Special parking
8. Facilitation of access to all programs
9. Access to special adaptive equipment
10. Referral to appropriate on- or off-campus resources, services, and agencies
11. Arrangements for specialized educational materials
12. Establishment and maintenance of a list of available readers, interpreters, notetakers, mobility assistants, and attendants
13. Supplemental orientation as determined by individual needs
14. Test-taking arrangements

Reader, interpreter and notetaker services, which help disabled students to complete their academic programs, are provided as core services. Other services are available for the disabled students based on their needs and the resources of each campus.

Attachment B

List of Potential Services:

Tutoring

Assessment of Learning Disability

Assistance in the Admissions Process

Personal Advising/Counseling

Consultation with Faculty

Off-Campus Transportation

Mobility Guides (For Deaf-Blind or Severely Disabled Students)

Personal Care Attendants

Library/Research Assistants

Laboratory/Computer Assistants

Typists

Test Proctors

Outreach

Coordination of Readers, Interpreters, Notetakers, Etc.

Equipment of Repair

Academic Advising

**************************************************

Services Suggested by Other Individual Coordinators:

Bookstore Assistance

Adaptive Physical Education

Computer Lab

Educational Enhancement

Personal Counseling

Employment/Career Specialist

Financial Aid Assistant

Assistant Director Position

Savage

**Los Angeles County Office of Education**

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
SOUTHWEST SCHOOL
P.O. Box 671
4141 West 156th Street
Lawndale, CA 90260-2231
(213) 679-9705

Stuart E. Gothold
Superintendent

Los Angeles County
Board of Education

Michaelene D. Wagner
President

Daniel L. Towler
Vice President

Ruth Bloom

Lawrence J. Kaplan,
D.D.S., F.I.C.D.

Mary E. Lewis

Ricardo J. Olivarez

Earl V. Pullias

Regarding: Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3
Relative to disabled persons (Vasconcellos)

Hearing: May 23, 1986
El Camino Community College
Torrance, Ca.

Name: Roberta Savage

Title: Principal

Organization: Southwest School, L.A. County Office of Education

Population Served: Hearing Impaired
Visually Impaired

This June, 60% of the students exiting Southwest School will attend postsecondary education. Major factors which will assure the success of future students include a process to provide transition programs for disabled students on Junior College and 4-year college campuses. Increased counseling, provided by sign language interpreters, and designed for the visually handicapped will promote the secondary/postsecondary transition. Through partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions, our goal will be achieved.

Roberta Savage
Roberta Savage, Principal

**Los Angeles County Office of Education**

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
SOUTHWEST SCHOOL
P.O. Box 671
4141 West 156th Street
Lawndale, CA 90260-2231
(213) 679-9705

Stuart E. Gothold
Superintendent

**Los Angeles County Board of Education**

Michaelene D. Wagner
President

Daniel L. Towler
Vice President

Ruth Bloom

Lawrence J. Kaplan, D.D.S., F.I.C.D.

Mary E. Lewis

Ricardo J. Olivarez

Earl V. Pullias

June 2, 1986

Bruce D. Hamlett
Government and Public Affairs
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Dear Mr. Hamlett,

At your request I have written a detailed report of testimony presented by myself and Walter Crowder May 23 at El Camino College. Some of the figures used in this report vary slightly from my original testimony. Southwest School serves 220 hearing impaired and visually handicapped pupils in the South Bay area through the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Question No's. 1, 2, 5 and 11

Hearing impaired students in Los Angeles County Special Education programs are currently served from infancy to age twenty-two. Visually handicapped are served from age three to twenty-two.

Service models for disabled students in K-12 programs include:

--Home instruction for hearing impaired infants.

--County-operated special day classes with mainstreaming provided from preschool through completion of the secondary program.

--Designated instructional service for disabled students enrolled in their neighborhood schools.

--District operated resource specialist programs.

--Vocational rehabilitation counselors currently assist students in their transition from secondary to post-secondary programs.

--County-operated transition programs for disabled students between the ages of 18-22 are currently housed on one four-year college and two junior college campuses in Los Angeles County. Teachers, aides and materials are provided by the Los Angeles County Office of Education. These classes have proven to be highly effective for the special education students enrolled in them.

From a total population of 220 hearing impaired and/or visually impaired students at Southwest School, thirteen will exit the program in June. Six plan to attend postsecondary education. Of these, one needs to resolve his residency status. Five will enter the work force, three without diplomas. Two will move. During the year, three hearing impaired students dropped out. Of these, one enrolled at El Camino for a more flexible schedule, one entered the work force, one moved, with no request for records received.

Hearing impaired students interviewed indicate social pressure to leave school at 18 is a major factor in the drop-out rate for them. Housing secondary classes for 18-22 year olds on postsecondary campuses allows disabled students to complete their graduation requirements among age-appropriate peers.

A transition process involving cooperation between secondary and postsecondary providers is essential. This process should include counselors who are familiar with local postsecondary programs and services.

Based upon interviews, visually handicapped students exiting our programs see their biggest barriers to postsecondary education being:

- Lack of readers for the blind.
- Time requirements to complete assignments in Braille.
- Transportation from home to school for wheelchair users.
- Campus mobility for the blind.

A May graduate from Gallaudet College was interviewed. She plans to attend CSUN in September to obtain her MA in counseling. She plans to become a school counselor for the deaf. Her suggestions include:

- More interpreters for elementary mainstreamed classes for the deaf.
- More decoders and captioning for educational TV at home and at school.
- More deaf (or blind) teachers.
- Orientations addressing what to expect at college.
    - How to use the library
    - How to find information
- Standardization of sign language systems used by interpreters.
- Counseling in the area of deaf culture.
- Increased individual attention from kindergarten through postsecondary programs.
- Developing activities and organizations for disabled students to promote their abilities of leadership that could be used to help the disabled in the future.

Other suggestions for accommodations and skills to prepare disabled students for postsecondary education include:

- Raising levels of student, teacher and parent expectations.

- Computer laboratories to build language, English grammar and writing skills as well as computer skills for the hearing impaired. These classes can provide a transition to remedial programs, leading to regular coursework offered by the junior colleges.
- TDD and telephone skills for the hearing impaired to assist their transition.
- FM amplification systems to be used from kindergarten through post-secondary education.
- Adjustment of time requirements for tests (ie. CBEST) to allot for the additional time required to complete tests in Braille.
- Increased accessibility to braille emboss computers, readers, braillists and/or speech synthesized materials for the visually impaired.
- Mobility training for campus orientation and access to public transportation.

Question No. 6

Activities and techniques to improve counseling include:

- Increased numbers of counselors - educational and psychological - who sign.
- Counseling by disabled peers to include affective counseling, deaf culture, etc.
- Counseling provided to increase student and parent awareness of post-secondary options for the disabled.
- Counseling to provide information regarding services and agencies specific to handicaps. Information regarding access to the services. e.g. services for the blind.
- Legal counseling to address students who have no financial support and have the additional problem of legal US residency.
- Counseling to accommodate non-English speaking students and parents.
- Counseling to address the increasing numbers of multihandicapped pupils we are seeing.

Question No. 11

Critical needs/recommendations:

- Hearing and visually impaired students require more time to receive equal amounts of information than non-disabled peers.
- Suggestion:
  - --Provide transition classes for 19-22 year olds on high school, junior college, or adult education campuses.
  - --Reader services for the blind.
  - --Tutoring services using sign language interpreters.

- Language skills, specifically English grammar and writing skills.

  Suggestion:

  --Expansion of language/writing laboratories utilizing computer assisted instruction.

- Psychological needs must be addressed.

- Follow-up studies of disabled students exiting K-12 programs throughout the state would provide information necessary for realistic and appropriate future planning.

Conclusion:

Through partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions, our mutual goal of proportionate student representation and achievement in postsecondary education will be achieved.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Roberta Savage, Principal

RS/bjg

Draft 2. May 22. 1986. uncorrected.

Jerome F. Shapiro
2404 Narbonne Way, Costa Mesa, CA 92627
(714) 645-3825

My name is Jerome Franklin Shapiro. I am a doctoral student in Comparative Culture, School of Social Sciences, U.C.I., I an also a teaching assistant for the program.

I will be addressing part one, question three, as it relates to my expeiences as quote "marginally" disabled leaning handicapped student. My presentation has two parts. Afterwards, I will be happy to answer questions.

Part one. Marginally learning disabled students are stigmatized in rather curious ways. First, often because your handicap is not visible, you are not believed when you complain of a problem. You are often labeled as immataure, or a slow starter. Second, When someone finally agrees to test you, the test fails to find a problem. Marginally handicapped students are as bright, intelligent, and capable as anyone else. We quickly learn to to compensate or bypass the testing procedure. Tests only test one's test taking abilities. No one is better at figuring out the logic of a test then someone who does not understand the subject matter. Third, because no one can figure out why I was doing so badly in school, no one could not find a "place for me." So, a place was made where I did not belong. This is a common syndrome. I, and others, get shuffled along from one special class room to another. Eventually I too began to believe that nothing could be done. My self-esteem plumeted, my self-confidence was non-existent, my love for learning was almost crushed ~~to death.~~ By my sophomore year of high school I was so depressed that I needed psychological counceling. Nevertheless, I ~~beat~~ the system.
survived

Unlike a lot of my friends, I graduated from high school, though I was still unprepared. Once in college, the marginally disabled finds him or herself in a vicious cycle as I have. Because you don't have the academic record you don't get a scholarship. If you don't get a scholarsnip, your grades go down, and you don't get the accademic recognition. And so the cycle continues. Furthermore, there are no support systems for the marginally disabled, especially financial aid. The marginally disabled attracts very little interest.

I personally have tried to reconcile myself to the fact that it is an imperfect world. At one point I dropped out of school, I worked and saved my money so I could concentrate on my studies with out interruption. Well, I made it this far, and I am happy with that. Yet, regardless of my abilities, I can not expect the accademic recognition that I deserve.

Why should I be able to go on where others fell behind. I think a lot has to do with personality. For some reason, the less people listened to me the more I was determined to be heard. For me, a little encouragement went a long way. Many of my friends were not quite as obsessive, and dropped out of school early. My sister eventually succumbed to the pressure and now believes that she has no potential to learn. Why me and not my sister. Maybe, as recent studies have show, it had something to with gender and the attention one recieves in the class room. But explanations of the past offer one little hope for the future.

Part two. As far as I am concerned I recieved the attention and help I needed in only two places. In both places, testing was put aside infavor of a more personal, one to one evalutive aproach. No one told me what they could do for me, no one offered a Latin name as though it would magically sovle the problem. Instead, they asked what I felt was wrong, and what I felt I needed. People just worked with me. The first place was in Jr. college. At the JC. I did not see specialist, but my own professors. They were professional educators who had the training, time, interest, and small enough classes to deal with my problems. If I was having difficulty, I would go to their office and worked with them.

The second place was Helen Irlen, now of the Irlen Institute. When I went to her she asked me what I thought the problem was, and she listened. For the first time in my life, when I told someone that my eyes gave me problems I wasn't told it was because I was growing. After twentyseven years, it was discovered that that my eyes are so sensitive to light it interfers with my reading, comprehension, and even my class room behavior. Today I wear tinted glass, and often a hat, in order to decrease my sensitivity.

In conclussion. The answer is not in more sophisticated testing. It is not even in bigger batteries of tests. It lies in evaluation. The answer is not remediation but proper education at an early level. This means better trained teachers at primary levels, smaller class rooms, and a decreased dependence on the stigmatizing effect of the ~~so called~~ specialist. Though I have not read the report, from what I have heard, and from my own experiences, the answer may lie in addopting something like the recent Carnnege report.

# TESTIMONY OF PATRICIA M. SONNTAG, DIRECTOR
# SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
FOR ACR 3 HEARINGS, MAY 28, 1986

## I. FINANCING SERVICES FOR DISABLED STUDENTS, TASK FORCE #2

A. The primary question should have been "What are the positions and staffing levels that are necessary to provide adequate and appropriate services to ensure reasonable accommodation to all disabled university students?" The following is my suggested long range staffing pattern:

(1 FTE) DEAF DISABILITY MANAGEMENT COUNSELOR (SSP III-AR)

Staff Interpreter (with benefits) (Needs a recognized classification)

* On-Call Interpreters (Needs a funding source that generates COLA'S similar to Temporary Help Account rather than Contractual Account)

* Tutors

* Notetakers

* Deaf-Blind (DB) Mobility Guides -- costs approximately $15,000/year for 1 DB carrying 9 units

* (DB) Braillists

(1 FTE) BLIND DISABILITY MANAGEMENT COUNSELOR (SSP III)

* Braillist

* Readers

* Orientation Guide for Cane Travelling ($42/hour)

* Computer Instructional Specialist

(1 FTE) MOBILITY IMPAIRED DISABILITY MANAGEMENT COUNSELOR (SSP III-AR)

* Golf Cart Scheduler and Drivers

* Attendant/Pusher

* Wheelchair Repairperson

* Laboratory/Computer Assistants

- Typists

(1 FTE) LEARNING DISABLED SPECIALIST (SSP III-AR)

- 1 Psychometrist (SSP II-AR)
- Graduate Assistants
- Tutors

LIBRARY

- 1 FTE Adaptive Equipment Trainer (SSP I)
- Graduate Assistants
- Tutors

TESTING

- Proctors for in-class exams, national and specialty exams, final exams, entrance and exit exams

OUTREACH - SCHOOL AND COLLEGE RELATIONS

- 1 FTE Outreach Counselor (SSP II-AR)

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

- 1 FTE Adaptive (P.E. Consultant - AR)

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT CENTER

- 1 FTE Employment Specialist to assist with full-time/part-time placement needs, including Graduate School admission and Self-Support Plans (SSP III)

SSWD ADMINISTRATION

In addition to the FTE Director and Secretary, the office needs:

- 1 FTE Assistant Director (SSSP I)
- 1 Office Manager (CA IV)

- Clerical Assistant
- 1 FTE Support Services Specialist (SSP I-AR)
- Student Assistants

B. Concerning accessible facilities, are campuses in compliance with Title 24 Building Codes in relation to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973's required Transition Plan? What is the compliance status of all campuses on renovation work for Capitol and Minor Capitol Outlay Projects? Are testing, counseling, and library study resource rooms for the disabled adequately soundproof and is there requisite equipment available? What is the purpose of conducting outreach if the facilities are not accessible for all types of disabilities?

Are the Department of Finance, Legislative Analysts Office and CPEC willing to support Capitol Outlay projects under separate funding as a crucial issue in compliance with ACR 3. The state is responsible for assuring compliance with Barrier Removal Laws since Title 24 Building Codes are California laws. Compliance requires a new survey to review status on all campuses. This requires commitment to fund buildings that do not meet code compliance. These are essentially health and safety code violations.

C. What services are necessary for the successful accommodation of disabled students in order for them to complete their education at a post-secondary institution in California?

Based on the ideal staffing of an office that serves students with disabilities, what are the core services that can be allowed based on recognized serialized positions in the Governor's budget? Some of the core services are poorly defined and none (other than the deaf) have been cost factored. Does the Mobility Assistance Core Service include: Mobility Orientation for the Blind Cane Travelers at $42/hour? Does it include Mobility Guides for the Deaf/Blind? IHSS will not allow attendant care payment for out-of-home use. This is also true for personal attendants. Who is to pay for attendants and pushers? What is the allowable cost for operating a golf cart transit service on campus? Has this been factored in, and if so, is this included in the core service "Mobility Assistance"?

Do the current Reader and Notetaker job classifications extend to hiring Computer Instructional Aides? Under what job classification? What is the rate of pay? The committee should review CSU Hayward's core services survey recently published.

D. What principles should the state follow in funding services for students with disabilities?

One cannot perform outreach services until funding, core services and positions are funded and stabilized. Outreach services presume that a full continuum of services are available at each campus for each disability category.

We should continue with the Core Service concept and not attempt to invent a new forced common set of criteria. We have an imperfect system that now needs some polishing and refinement.

Equivalent standards for cost, services and staffing covered seems reasonable across all three segments. The only additional area might be whether the Community Colleges can continue to serve the Developmentally Disabled and Mentally Ill based on the Master Plan Revisions.

The State must make a commitment to support specific serialized positions across all segments as its guiding principle. In the past, we have had the cart before the horse. We have always been more concerned about the total dollar amount available than a comprehensive plan to serve the disabled.

DSS programs have been historically underfunded. The programs have been viewed as temporary in nature. This has created management and morale problems. Stable funding sufficient to cover even the core services has not yet been experienced. To date, the Governor's Budget only recognizes two positions: 1 FTE Director and 1 Secretary. This cannot continue. The bulk of our money comes in "Temporary Help Blanket Accounts" and Contractual Services.

Outreach Services should not be handled in the DSS Office, but rather folded into the School and College Relations staffing pattern. It would be appropriate that the money to hire comes into SSWD initially in order to "protect" it and ensure that such a hiring takes place. Evaluation and accountability for successful outreach services should be similar to those already in place for the SCR office.

A Guiding Principle mutually agreed upon by all coordinators is that we need to return to the Protected funding category. Our programs are legally mandated for services. The receipt of our services directly impacts the students' academic performance.

The bottom line is a statewide consensus exists that our programs are underfunded. Once we arrive at the total dollar amount needed, we then need to formulate a plan on when we want to incrementally arrive at full funding. The last step in this process is outreach services.

E. How are costs in the Disabled Students Program affected by changes in the institutional budget as a whole?

There is an assumption that our programs are protected at the campus level. This is not wholly true. If the University has other priorities, the President can now direct SSWD monies to support programs that have no relationship to the disabled student and the core services required. This encroachment has been happening more frequently with more campuses each year.

There is also increased concern that under the guise of educational equity and consolidation that this will only hasten the occurance of encroachment unless language is reinserted to protect these funds. This is not inviting a Monster into our lives but rather ensuring that funds are expended as the legislature intended.

## II. EVALUATION

The directive for provision of services was transferred to the CSU DSS offices without the provision of professional personnel to implement this mandate. At one time, services were available through outside sources. When Department of Rehabilitation withdrew support, we experienced a profound need to establish staffing stability. An adequate formula would encompass:

A. Permanent full-time professional level staffing that is fixed.

B. Flexibility that allows variance to establish appropriate level service funding:

1. Growth in populations
2. Regional differences, especially in high cost areas
3. Differences in disability categories, some of which are high cost and complex
4. Cost of living increases
5. Inclusion of Extended Education students in the funding base.

Our students do well in terms of achievement and graduation rates. But evaluation should be contingent on outcome data once the programs are fully funded. Evaluation based on GPA, unit loads, length of time required to complete a degree, extension and drop-out rates and number of students obtaining appropriate employment commensurate with their degrees obtained are artificial indicators.

Our programs were instituted to accomplish one goal -- to gain access to the institutions. Our programs do not teach subjects. Our students are not Special Admits, but rather are educationally competitive.

With the advent of new admission criteria, the proliferation of admission and exit exams, a tripling of tuition costs, the thrust of evaluative standards should examine the impact of enrollment resulting from these changes.

Meaningful evaluative criteria would identify whether, as a result of these new procedures instituted by CSU, disabled student enrollment increased. Were the students adequately handled in the testing offices, LSC, and admission offices? Were the students able to find physical access?

Since the shift in DR sponsorship for readers, notetakers, and interpreters, there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of students sponsored by DR. At CSUS where we have identified 435 students as of Fall 1985, only 18 were sponsored by DR. Fall 1984 reflected a total decrease of over 27 percent from 1981. Each year the decrease in sponsorship grows. This is a serious concern that needs a policy change.

Students who are in need of attendant care or mobility guides (such as the deaf/blind) are dependent on In-Home Supportive Care from the County Department of Social Services. These funds are restricted to use only in the home. Thus, students are not allowed to use their funds for on-campus needs. 504 and CSU policy additionally restrict DSS offices from directly supporting students needing such services. Policy changes are needed in this area.

Financial Aid grants (PELL) and Loans (NDSL, CGSL) frequently are not extended to the disabled population, many of whom rely on entitlement programs for subsidizing their educational goals. As cost of living escalates and the economy for the poor worsens, the financial security of the disabled aspiring to attend higher education institutions becomes more fragile.

Adequate evaluative criteria and progress measurements need to address the aforementioned areas. Until interagency policies have changed to allow an increase in DR sponsorship; financial aid packages extended; support from IHSS for on-campus needs; the achievement of fully funded programs; and fully accessible campus facilities, I do not believe we can accurately evaluate student progress.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Review all institutional self-evaluations made for 504.
2. Review transition plans for Architectural Barrier Removal access projects still requiring funding.
3. Place disabled on all policy committees in the university and at systemwide levels.
4. Renew interagency agreements to increase services to disabled.
5. Review all Admission and Exit policies and procedures to assure discrimination against disabled does not occur.
6. Review Educational Equity Programs currently in place to see whether they exclude disabled in funding thrusts.

## III. OUTREACH

I have mixed feelings about moving DSS in the direction of outreach activity. I feel that this could more effectively be handled through currently funded programs, such as School and College Relations, SAA and Educational Equity programs.

ACR 3 does not address those students who are injured in adulthood, and thus are not part of the high school population. CSUS students with disabilities have a higher representation for those over 30 years of age as compared to the total student population. The average age of our total student population is 26 years, while the disabled is 32.

In past years, there has been a significant decline in male student enrollment. A higher percentage of disabled students are Black, Native American, and Caucasian, while there are fewer Asians and Hispanics identified. But the frequency/incidence of those attending higher education institutions who are severely disabled minority students has not been tracked. The disability rates by ethnicity have been documented in the 1980 California Disability Survey and need to be further studied in relation to CSU's enrollment trends.

Biological Sciences, Communications, Engineering Sciences, Business Administration and Mathematics major concentrations reflect an underrepresentation on a consistent basis. This is followed by Foreign Language, Health Professions, and Letters. Some method of targeting these majors to increase enrollment would seem warranted.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Reidentify targeted outreach populations to include ethnic considerations, severity of disability, first time freshmen, adult onset of disability. Consider financial incentives to increase attendance in under-represented majors.

2. Fund outreach activities incrementally and last after fully funding the program.

3. Fund the outreach activities through SSWD to be integrated into existing institutional outreach programs.

4. Establish funding for outreach travel monies as well as professional staffing.

5. Targeting outreach activities to hospitals, and other existing minority community programs (e.g. Consilio) seems required. High school outreach is myopic in terms of historic data on disabled enrollment.

# *APPENDIX*

## *Presenters of Testimony at the Regional Hearings*

### SAN DIEGO, May 22, 1986

Elizabeth Bacon, CSU San Diego

Helen Elias, San Diego Community College District

Jerry Figley, Workability--Vista U.S.D.

Mary Ann Golembesky, California Assn. for Neurologically Handicapped Children

Anne Heller, San Diego Community College

Tom Humphries, San Diego Community College District

Connie Wilbur, UC San Diego

### LOS ANGELES, May 23, 1986

Beverly K. Barrett, CSU Los Angleles

Walter Crowder, Southwest School

Julia C. Haraksin, UC Irvine

Bob Hughlett, Cerritos Community College District

Mark Matsui, CSU Dominguez Hills

Paul K. Miller, CSU Fullerton

Nadia Powers, Los Angeles City Council on Disability and California Association of the Physically Handicapped

Roberta Savage, Southwest School

Jerome F. Shapiro, UC Irvine

Jane Small, Los Angeles City Council on Disability and California Association of the Physically Handicapped

### SACRAMENTO, May 28, 1986

Michael Baillif, National Federation of the Blind, Student Division

Sharon Bonnie, Disabled Students' Program, UC Berkeley

Michael C. Harbeson, UC Davis

Eugene Lozano, Jr., CSU Sacramento

Susan Eiland, CSU Sacramento

Nancy E. Haley, Head Trauma Support Project

Jackie Mann, CSU Sacramento

Kristin Oberg, UC Davis

Pat Sonntag, CSU Sacramento

Patricia Stewart, CSU Chico

Joel Tochterman, UC Berkeley

Louis Yanez, California Community Colleges, Chancellery

### SAN JOSE, May 29, 1986

Carol Cooper, Gavilan College

William B. Cutler, Self-Help for Hard of Hearing People

J. Trey Duffy, CSU San Jose

Velma L. Elliott, North Region Special Education Local Plan Area

Bruce Gabriel,CSU San Jose

Cindy Kolb,CSU San Francisco

Betsy Nordmeyer, Santa Clara Unified School District

Paul Preston, CSU Hayward

Martin B. Schulter, CSU San Jose

### FRESNO, May 30, 1986

Harriet Clendenen, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Ana Garza, CSU Fresno

Martha Hansen, CSU Fresno

Gordon F. Johnson, CSU Fresno

Roland L. Jones, California Student Assoc. of Community Colleges

Paul Lockman, Region 5, Disabled Students Services Program Directors Representative, California Community Colleges

Florie Luther, CSU Fresno

Nancy Mitchell, CSU Fresno

Maria Morais, CSU Fresno

# CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

## Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1986, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Seth P. Brunner, Sacramento, *Chairperson*
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Patricia Gandara, Sacramento
Ralph J. Kaplan, Los Angeles
Roger C. Pettitt, Los Angeles
Sharon N. Skog, Mountain View
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Mokelumne Hill

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; representing the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; representing the Trustees of the California State University

Beverly Benedict Thomas, Los Angeles; representing the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Jean M. Leonard, San Mateo; representing California's independent colleges and universities

Willa Dean Lyon, Newport Beach; representing the Chairman of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Angie Papadakis, Palos Verdes; representing the California State Board of Education

## Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

## Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission issues some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# COMMENTS FROM THE COMMUNITY

## Working Papers and Testimony Before the ACR 3 Committee

### California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 86-23

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933

Other recent reports of the Commission include:

**86-5** Background for Expanding Educational Equity: A Technical Supplement to the Report of the Intersegmental Policy Task Force on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83, *Expanding Educational Equity in California's Schools and Colleges* (March 1986)

**86-6** Director's Report, March 1986: Overview of the 1986-87 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California (March 1986)

**86-7** Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California: A Report Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1986)

**86-8** Feasibility Plan for a Comprehensive Student Information Study: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Assembly Bill 880 (1984) (March 1986)

**86-9** The Need for Statewide Long-Range Capital Outlay Planning in California: An Issue Paper Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Frank M. Bowen. (March 1986)

**86-10** High School-College Relations in California and The Articulation Council: A Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by William Chance (April 1986)

**86-11** Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, University of California and the California State University, Fall 1985 (April 1986)

**86-12** Time and Territory: Phase II. A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1985-86 Budget Act. (April 1986)

**86-13** Progress in Facilitating the Transfer of Community College EOPS Students: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Assembly Bill 1114 (Chapter 1586, Statutes of 1985) (April 1986)

**86-14** A Permanent Site for Los Angeles Mission College: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to a Request for Capital Funds from the Los Angeles Community College District. (April 1986)

**86-15** Student Financial Aid in California: The First of Two Background Papers on Student Financial Aid Issues and Options Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission, May 1986 (May 1986)

**86-16** Purposes and Effects of Student Financial Aid: The Second of Two Background Papers on Student Financial Aids Issues and Options Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission, May 1986 (May 1986)

**86-17** Director's Report, May 1986: Enrollment Trends in California Higher Education, 1980-1985 (May 1986)

**86-18** Director's Report, June 1986: The Master Plan After Twenty-Five Years (June 1986)

**86-19** Analysis of the State University's Criteria for Approving Permanent Upper-Division and Graduate Off-Campus Centers: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Bills 785, 1060, and 1103 (1985) (June 1986)

**86-20** Annual Report on Program Review Activities 1984-85: The Tenth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities (June 1986)

**86-21** Eligibility for Institutional Participation in the Cal Grant Program: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Bill 362 (Chapter 772, Statutes of 1985) (June 1986)

**86-22** Transforming Data into Information: Improving Student Performance Reporting: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (June 1986)